DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 239 541 HE 016 963

TITLE	A Comparison of the University of Maryland with Its Peer Institutions. Postsecondary Education Research Reports.
INSTITUTION	Maryland State Board for Higher Education, Annapolis.
SPONS AGENCY	National Center for Education Statistics (ED), Washington, DC.; State Higher Education Executive Officers Association.
PUB DATE	Dec 83
NOTE	87p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Maryland State Board for Higher Education, 16 Francis Street, Annapolis, MD 21401.
PUB TYPE	Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Academic Rank (Professional); Aptitude Tests; Budgeting; College Faculty; College Libraries; College Programs; Comparative Analysis; Degrees (Academic); *Educational Finance; *Employment Practices; *Enrollment Trends; Expenditures; Financial Support; Higher Education; Income; *Institutional Characteristics; *State Universities; Student Characteristics; Teacher Salaries; Tenure
IDENTIFIERS	*Peer Institutions; *University of Maryland

ABSTRACT

Comparisons of the University of Maryland (the University) with peer institutions are provided concerning characteristics of the student population, institutional resources, and financial resources and expenditure patterns. Findings include the following: part-time enrollment at the University accounts for a significantly higher proportion of total enrollment than is the case for the peer group as a whole; the University enrolls a greater proportion of its students as undergraduates than do the peers; average faculty salaries at the University for the ranks of professor, associate professor, and assistant professor are comparable to those of peers; administrative salaries for 23 positions at the University are below medians for the peer group; the University expended significantly less per student for libraries than did its peer institutions during funding year 1982; and wide variations among institutions existed during 1982 in total revenues and expenditures, in expenditures by program, and revenues by source among institutions. Information is also provided on National Merit Scholars, Scholastic Aptitude Test scores, and budget guidelines. Information on the peer institutions are appended. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED239541

A Comparison of the
University of Maryland
with its Peer Institutions

POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION RESEARCH REPORTS

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Maryland State Board for Higher Education

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

A Comparison of the University of Maryland with its Peer Institutions

State Board for Higher Education
16 Francis Street
Annapolis, Maryland 21401

December, 1983

State of Maryland

STATE BOARD FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

The State Postsecondary Education Commission

Thomas H. Maddux, Chairman

J. Harrison Ager, Vice Chairman

Gertrude H. Crist, Secretary

Dr. Thelma B. Cox

Bernard T. Devaney

Lucy Keker

Richard R. Kline

Honorable Mary L. Nock

Philip Pear

Harry K. Wells

Dr. Sheldon H. Knorr
Commissioner of Higher Education

The Maryland State Board for Higher Education is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer.

FOREWORD

The State Board for Higher Education has prepared this report on comparisons of the University of Maryland with its peer institutions to provide a benchmark against which the University's progress toward the goal of being among the top public universities in the country can be measured. The report provides information on comparisons made in three areas: characteristics of the student population, institutional resources, and financial resources and expenditure patterns.

We are grateful for the cooperation and assistance provided by the University of Maryland and by staff at the peer institutions and at the governing and coordinating boards in the states where the peer institutions are located. These persons are listed in the acknowledgements.

Ms. Sandra Allard, Dr. Lucie Lapovsky, and Dr. Mary McKeown of the Division of Finance and Facilities had responsibility for this report.

Sheldon H. Knorr
Commissioner

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Recognition is due to John Wittstruck of the SHEEO-NCES network which provided funding for this project. Special thanks are given to Norman Brandt of NCES for providing us with much of the data which we needed. We wish to express our appreciation to all the people in the peer institutions and SHEEO agencies who provided data and assistance for this report. These individuals are listed alphabetically by state. In addition to these individuals listed below, other individuals in these states whose names we never learned also provided assistance to us in this project.

California: George Anderson
Ronald Brady
Loris Davanzo
Robert Glock
Marit Marino
William Pickens
Jesse Shaw
Barbara Stratton

Illinois: Peter Cziakowski
Jackie Finch
Marcia Langsjoen
Paul Lingenfelter
Steven Rugg
Dave Stewart

Maryland: Marilyn Brown
Mary Leach
Donald Myers
Linda Vukovich

Michigan: Bob Endriss
Gary Hawkes
Ronald Jursa
R. Sue Mimms
Ralph Nichols
Mary Ries

North Carolina: Gary Barnes
Ken Grogan
L. Felix Joyner

Texas: James Bedrich
Eddie Davis
Marsha Ivery
William Lasher
John Porretto
Robert Smith
William Webb

Virginia: Stephen Campbell
Dan Hicks
Michael Mullen

Wisconsin: Elwin Cammack
Martha Casery
Richard Norris
Norma Rees

Sheldon H. Knorr
Commissioner

A Comparison of the University of Maryland
with its Peer Institutions

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 1982 Report of the Joint Chairmen of the Senate Budget and Taxation Committee and the House Appropriations Committee requested that the level of comparability between the University of Maryland and its peers be evaluated by the staff of the State Board for Higher Education. This report, undertaken by the SBHE in cooperation with the University of Maryland, provides comprehensive comparisons of the University of Maryland with its peer institutions. The data reported here will provide the benchmark against which the University's progress toward the goal of being among the top public universities in the country can be measured. Data were gathered by visiting the peer institutions. To facilitate comparisons, data were organized into three areas: characteristics of the student population, institutional resources, and financial resources and expenditure patterns.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STUDENT POPULATION

Enrollment and Degrees

Part-time enrollment at the University of Maryland accounts for a significantly higher proportion (37.8 percent) of total enrollment than is the case for the peer group as a whole (17.0 percent). The University of Maryland enrolls a greater proportion of its students as undergraduates (80.4 percent) than do its peers (74.9 percent), and consequently, enrolls fewer graduate and professional students (19.6 percent) than do the peers (25.1 percent). As would be expected from enrollment patterns, the University of Maryland awards a higher proportion of bachelor's degrees (76.6 percent) than do its peers (66.6 percent).

National Merit Scholars and SAT Scores

In the Fall of 1982, the University of Maryland Maryland at College Park enrolled 28 Merit Scholars. Among the peers, the number of Merit Scholars enrolled varied from 15 at North Carolina State University to 190 at Texas A & M. In the Fall of 1982, SAT scores for entering freshmen at the University of Maryland-College Park averaged 982, almost 100 points above the national average of 893. Among the peer institutions, SAT scores varied from a low of 965 at the University of Michigan Flint to a high of 1,200 at the University of Virginia. All of these scores are significantly above the national average and indicate that these schools attract a high calibre of student.

INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES

Faculty

The most recent data (FY 1983) indicate that average faculty salaries at the University of Maryland for the ranks of professor, associate professor, and assistant professor are comparable to those of peers. The all ranks average faculty salary at the University of Maryland was $29,257 compared with $32,515 among the peers. A comparison of the distribution of faculty by rank shows that the University of Maryland had a smaller percentage (25.9 percent) of faculty at

the rank of professor than did the peers (43.7 percent), and that 68 percent of the faculty at peer institutions have been awarded tenure compared to 59.1 percent at the University of Maryland. Differences in distribution of faculty by rank and tenure do not imply differences in quality; rather, these distributions are largely the result of individual institutional policy decisions. At this point, the University of Maryland should have greater flexibility than its peer institutions to respond to shifts in demand for academic programs and to develop new areas.

Administrators

The administrative structure of universities varies considerably from institution to institution, making comparisons somewhat difficult. However, in the area of administrative salaries, for twenty-three administrative positions for which data were available, salaries at the University of Maryland are consistently and substantially below medians for the peer group.

Academic Programs

At the bachelor's degree level, the distribution of degrees awarded by program area at the University of Maryland is similar to that of the peer group as a whole. The University of Maryland awards a smaller proportion of its degrees in Engineering, and a higher proportion of its degrees in Health Professions than do its peers. Greater variation exists at the graduate level, where the University of Maryland awards a much higher proportion of its doctoral degrees in Education than do the peer institutions. Among rankings of the quality of research-doctorate programs, the University of Maryland at College Park faculty ranked high in Economics, Electrical Engineering, Mathematics, and Physics, and compared favorably with rated peers in most disciplines.

Libraries and Computers

The University of Maryland expended significantly less per student ($217) for libraries than did its peer institutions ($361) during FY 1982. The peer institutions, on the average, were able to add four volumes per student while the University of Maryland added one. Among the peer institutions for whom data were available, expenditures and resources for academic computing exceeded resources available for the University of Maryland.

FINANCIAL RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURE PATTERNS

Revenues and Expenditures

Wide variations existed during FY 1982 in total revenues and expenditures, in expenditures by program, and revenues by source among institutions. These differences are attributable in part to differences in size among institutions, as well as differences in programs and levels of support from various sources. Consequently, comparisons were made on the basis of expenditures and revenues per full-time equivalent student (FTES). Revenues per FTES at the University of Maryland ($8,416) were 216 percent less than revenue per FTES at the peer institutions ($10,653). Similarly, expenditures per FTES at the University of Maryland ($8,219) lagged behind expenditures per FTES at the peer institutions

($11,245). There were differences in the patterns of expenditure and revenues; for example, the University of Maryland received 20.1 percent of its revenues from tuition and fees while the peer institutions, on the average, received 13.9 percent of revenues from tuition and fees. State Funds per FTES at the peer institutions ($5,762) exceeded those at the University of Maryland ($4,528) by more than $1,000 per FTES.

Budget Guidelines

The budget guidelines used in the analysis of budget requests by the State Board for Higher Education were calculated for the University of California Berkeley, the University of Illinois at UrbanaChampaign, the University of Michigan - Ann Arbor, and the University of Texas at Austin. Analysis of the data used in the guideline calculations indicated that the peer campuses had different distributions of credit hours by level and cost than did the University of Maryland at College Park. College Park had a distribution of credit hours that was more lower division and less graduate and graduate research than the distribution of credit hours at the peer campuses. The guideline amounts calculated per student were $6,350 for Berkeley, $5,350 for Urbana-Champaign, $7,000 for Ann Arbor, $4,750 for Austin, and $4,000 for College Park. The differences in calculated guideline estimates are primarily attributable to differences in enrollment patterns by level and type of program, and to differences in the total size of facilities at the campuses.

Conclusion

This report to provides information on a wide variety of areas for which comparisons among institutions/systems can be made. The University of Maryland receives less in State support per FTES and in Total support per FTES than any of the peer systems. It is clear that in certain areas major deficiencies exist. The peer systems enroll more high ability undergraduate students and provide more graduate education than the University of Maryland. The peer systems receive more funding for research than the University of Maryland; however, the University of Maryland compares favorably with its peers in terms of the quality of its graduate programs. These data provide a benchmark from which the University's progress in becoming one of the best public universities in the country can be measured.

A Comparison of the University of Maryland
with its Peer Institutions

During the past several years a number of reports have been prepared by SBHE comparing the University of Maryland to a group of institutions designated by the University as peers. In 1982 the report of the chairmen of the Senate Budget and Taxation Committee and the House Appropriations Committee requested that the level of comparability of the University of Maryland to its peers be evaluated by SBHE. The University of Maryland had used the following criteria to select the peer group:

1. The institutions must be part of a public system, combined into a system or part of a system.

2. The Land Grant institution of the state should be included.

3. The system should include a medical school and other professional schools.

4. The principal campus should be a member of the Association of American Universities.

5. The institutions should combine teaching, research, and service in their role and scope.

6. The institutions should represent quality systems.

7. The systems should include at least two doctoral granting campuses.

8. The systems should grant at least as many doctoral degrees as the University of Maryland and receive at least as many federal research funds per year.

The intent of the criteria was not to identify institutions that are identical to the University of Maryland if indeed there were any. The effort was to develop a set of similar institutions as a basis for data collection and presentation of comparable data.

Using these criteria, the University of Maryland had selected the following set of peers:

University of California System (10 campuses)
University of Illinois System (3 campuses)
University of Michigan System (3 campuses) and Michigan State University
University of Texas System (11 campuses)
University of Wisconsin System (Madison and Milwaukee campuses only)

The SBHE staff accumulated and analyzed data about faculty, student enrollments, academic programs, and research for all of these institutions. After careful review and consultation with the University of Maryland, the Legislature, and Executive, the SBHE recommended that several modifications to the peer group be made to strengthen its utility as a comparative tool. The SBHE generally agreed with the criteria being used by the University. However, the number of campuses included from the California and Texas systems was excessive and tended to distort the peer averages. Therefore, the number of campuses from these systems was reduced. Also, the land grant institution in Texas had not been included so Texas A&M University was added. Finally, in order to provide a more balanced regional representation the peer group was expanded to included the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, North Carolina State University, the University of Virginia, and Virginia Polytechnic Institute. The University and the SBHE agreed upon the following list as the peer institutions for the University of Maryland:

University of California-Berkeley, Davis, and San Diego
University of Illinois System
University of Michigan System
Michigan State University
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
North Carolina State University
University of Texas-Austin, and Health Science Center at Houston
Texas A&M University
University of Virginia
Virginia Polytechnic Institute
University of Wisconsin-Madison and Milwaukee

This list was formally adopted by SBHE in March, 1983.

The study presented in this paper has been undertaken by SBHE in cooperation with the University of Maryland to provide comprehensive comparisons of the University of Maryland with its new peer institutions. The data collected for this study will provide the benchmark against which progress toward the goal of being among the top public universities in the country can be

measured. To complete the comparisons, staff of the Maryland State Board for Higher Education traveled to California, Illinois, Michigan, North Carolina, and Texas, many of the states in which the peer institutions were located. In these states, meetings were held with the coordinating/governing board (SHEEO) staff and key staff members of the universities in question. The visits were required (1) to collect and examine detailed data from the specific set of institutions; (2) to assess the comparability of the data used; and (3) to gain an understanding of the similarities and differences among the institutions. The travel for this study was made possible by a grant from the Personnel Exchange of the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) - National Center for Education Statistics (NECS) network.

Data gathered included HEGIS faculty salary, enrollment, financial, and degrees awarded reports and the College and University Personnel Association (CUPA) administrative salary information. This data has been supplemented with information about students, tuition and fees, libraries, computers, federal research funding, facilities, and program evaluation from other sources.

To facilitate comparisons of the University of Maryland with its peers, the data collected has been organized in three areas:

1. Characteristics of the Student Population
2. Institutional Resources
3. Financial Resources and Expenditure Patterns

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STUDENT POPULATION

One important determinant of the similarity of institutions is the degree of similarity in the populations they are serving. To compare the University of Maryland and its peers, the SBHE examined enrollment patterns by level of instruction and by full-time/part-time status, degrees awarded by level, average SAT scores of entering students, and the numbers of National Merit Scholars enrolling as freshmen. The findings are outlined below.

Enrollment

Table 1 displays total headcount enrollment by institution and the percents full-time and part-time. Part-time enrollment at the University of Maryland accounts for a significantly higher proportion (37.8 percent) of total enrollment than is the case for the peer group as a whole (17.0 percent). At the University of Maryland, part-time enrollment ranges from 19.6 percent of total enrollment at UMAB to 26.8 percent at UMCP to 93.2 percent at UMUC. University College accounts for almost 45 percent of the part-time enrollment at the University of Maryland. None of the peer institutions/systems has a campus similar to University College; it is unique to the University of Maryland. At peer institutions extension credit students comparable to the students served by University College are usually reported at each of the specific campuses of the university system and therefore, are included in the enrollments of the campuses. Even if University College enrollments were excluded, part-time enrollment for the University of Maryland would be about 25.5 percent, still well above most peers.

Table 2 shows the distribution of headcount enrollment by level of instruction, i.e., undergraduate, first professional,and graduate. The University of Maryland has a greater proportion of its students enrolled as undergraduates (80.4 percent) compared with the peer institutions (74.9 percent). Graduate and professional enrollments are somewhat lower at the University of Maryland (19.6 percent) than those at the peer institutions (25.1 percent).

Table 1
Headcount Enrollment
Full-time and Part-Time
Fall, 1982

	Total	Full-Time	Percent Full-Time	Part-Time	Percent Part-Time
University of California					
Berkeley	29,296	26,900	91.8%	2,396	8.2%
Davis	19,321	17,822	92.2	1,499	7.8
San Diego	13,102	12,410	94.7	692	5.3
Total California	61,719	57,132	92.6	4,587	7.4
University of Illinois					
Urbana-Champaign	34,914	31,415	90.0%	3,499	10.0%
University Center	21,003	15,247	72.6	5,756	27.4
Health Science	4,259	3,574	83.9	685	16.1
Total Illinois	60,176	50,236	83.5	9,940	16.5
University of Michigan					
Ann Arbor	35,072	30,836	87.9%	4,236	12.1%
Dearborn	6,390	3,451	54.0	2,939	46.0
Flint	5,025	2,592	51.6	2,433	48.4
Michigan State	42,730	34,175	80.0	8,555	20.0
Total Michigan	89,217	71,054	79.6	18,163	20.4
U. of North Carolina					
Chapel Hill	22,071	18,599	84.3%	3,472	15.7%
North Carolina State	22,669	15,779	69.6	6,890	30.4
Total North Carolina	44,740	34,378	76.8	10,362	23.2
University of Texas					
Austin	48,039	42,181	87.8%	5,858	12.2%
Health Science-Houston	2,676	2,196	82.1	480	17.9
Texas A&M	36,127	31,672	87.7	4,455	12.3
Total Texas	86,842	76,049	87.6	10,793	12.4
University of Virginia	17,118	15,499	90.5%	1,619	9.5%
VPI	22,921	20,247	88.3	2,674	11.7
Total Virginia	40,039	35,746	89.3	4,293	10.7
University of Wisconsin					
Madison	42,230	35,246	83.5%	6,984	16.5%
Milwaukee	26,119	14,695	56.3	11,424	43.7
Total Wisconsin	68,349	49,941	73.1	18,408	26.9
Total Peers	451,082	374,536	83.0%	76,546	17.0%
University of Maryland					
College Park	37,046	27,121	73.2%	9,925	26.8%
Baltimore City	4,800	3,859	80.4	941	19.6
Eastern Shore	1,214	974	80.2	240	19.8
Baltimore County	7,384	5,636	76.3	1,748	23.7
University College	11,275	769	6.8	10,506	93.2
Total Maryland	61,719	38,359	62.2	23,360	37.8

Source: HEGIS Fall Enrollment and Compliance Report of Institutions of Higher Education, 1982

Table 2
Headcount Enrollment Percent by Level
University of Maryland and Designated Peers
Fall 1982

	Total	Under-graduate	First Professional	Graduate
University of California				
Berkeley	29,296	69.5%	3.9%	26.6%
Davis	19,321	72.8	7.2	20.0
San Diego	13,102	80.7	3.9	15.4
Total California	61,719	72.9	4.9	22.2
University of Illinois				
Urbana-Champaign	34,914	75.4%	2.8%	21.8%
University Center	21,003	82.4	-	17.6
Health Science	4,259	32.7	46.9	20.4
Total Illinois	60,176	74.8	4.9	20.6
University of Michigan				
Ann Arbor	35,072	63.8	9.6	26.6
Dearborn	6,390	91.1	-	8.9
Flint	5,025	84.4	-	15.6
Michigan State	42,730	77.6	2.9	19.5
Total Michigan	89,217	73.5	5.2	21.3
U. of North Carolina				
Chapel Hill	22,071	67.5%	7.7%	24.8%
North Carolina State	22,669	83.2	.4	16.4
Total North Carolina	44,740	75.4	4.0	20.6
University of Texas				
Austin	48,039	78.0%	3.4%	18.6%
Health Science-Houston	2,676	18.6	48.3	33.1
Texas A&M	36,127	82.5	1.8	15.7
Total Texas	86,842	78.1	4.1	17.8
University of Virginia	17,118	67.9%	9.8%	22.3%
VPI	22,921	79.3	.9	19.8
Total Virginia	40,039	74.4	4.7	20.9
University of Wisconsin				
Madison	42,230	69.2%	3.7%	27.1%
Milwaukee	26,119	83.4	-	16.6
Total Wisconsin	68,349	74.6	2.3	23.1
Total Peers	451,082	74.9	4.3	20.8
University of Maryland				
College Park	37,046	79.8%	- %	20.2%
Baltimore City	4,800	26.4	44.1	29.5
Eastern Shore	1,214	94.7	-	5.3
Baltimore County	7,384	94.1	-	5.9
University College	11,275	94.8	-	5.2
Total Maryland	61,719	80.4	3.4	16.2

Source: HEGIS Fall Enrollment and Compliance Report of Institutions of Higher Education, 1982

Degrees Awarded by Level

Table 3 shows the distribution of degrees awarded by level, i.e., bachelors, masters, doctorate and first professional. The University of Maryland awards a higher proportion of bachelors degrees (76.6 percent) than do peers (66.6 percent) and a lower proportion of masters degrees (14.4 percent) as compared with the peer institutions (22.1 percent) and doctorate degrees (3.8 percent versus 6.0 percent). Both the University of Maryland and its peers award about five percent of their degrees at the first professional level. This is consistent with the enrollment patterns described above.

National Merit Scholars and SAT Scores

One of the traditional indicators of institutional quality has been student body calibre and the reputation of an institution is based, in part, on the college's ability to attract undergraduates with strong scholastic credentials. Two measures of "strong scholastic credentials" are SAT scores and the presence of National Merit Scholars.

Table 4 displays the first year enrollment of Merit Scholars at the University of Maryland and its designated peers. The University of Maryland at College Park enrolled 28 Merit Scholars in Fall, 1982. Other campuses of the University of Maryland did not enroll any Merit Scholars. Among those peer institutions for which data were available, the number of Merit Scholars enrolled varied from fifteen at North Carolina State University to 190 enrolled at Texas A & M. Large numbers of scholars enrolled at Texas A & M, the University of Texas at Austin, and Michigan State University are due to particular programs at those institutions for "Institutional Merit Scholars."

Table 5 displays the average math, verbal, and total SAT scores for entering freshmen for the University of Maryland and its designated peers. Among the peer institutions the University of Illinois does not use SAT, but rather requires the ACT for entering students. At the University of Maryland at

Table 3
Degrees Awarded Including First Professional
University of Maryland and Designated Peers
1981-82

	Bachelors	Masters	Doctorate	First Professional	Total
University of California					
Berkeley	62.2%	25.2%	8.2%	4.4%	8,699
Davis	68.8	15.3	5.4	10.5	3,782
San Diego	75.8	10.4	7.9	5.9	2,020
Total California	65.8	20.6	7.4	6.2	14,501
University of Illinois					
Urbana-Champaign	66.3%	24.3%	6.2%	3.2%	9,110
University Center	71.7	26.2	2.1	-	2,935
Health Science	45.6	15.2	4.0	35.2	1,392
Total Illinois	65.3	23.8	5.1	5.8	13,437
University of Michigan					
Ann Arbor	49.5%	31.7%	11.5%	7.3%	10,267
Dearborn	94.0	6.0	-	-	900
Flint	100.0	-	-	-	497
Michigan State	71.0	21.4	4.7	2.9	10,430
Total Michigan	62.6	25.1	7.5	4.8	22,094
U. of North Carolina					
Chapel Hill	62.5%	23.0%	5.6%	8.9%	5,033
North Carolina State	76.8	17.3	5.9	-	3,441
Total North Carolina	68.3	20.7	5.7	5.3	8,474
University of Texas					
Austin	74.8%	15.6%	4.5%	5.1%	9,360
Health Science-Houston	28.3	26.8	7.0	37.9	699
Texas A&M	79.1	14.5	3.9	2.5	6,555
Total Texas	74.5	15.7	4.3	5.5	16,614
University of Virginia	58.0%	25.8%	4.5%	11.7%	4,454
VPI	75.4	19.9	4.7	-	4,829
Total Virginia	67.0	22.8	4.6	5.6	9,283
University of Wisconsin					
Madison	61.3%	25.7%	8.1%	4.9%	8,556
Milwaukee	71.2	27.7	1.1	-	3,107
Total Wisconsin	63.9	26.2	6.2	3.7	11,663
Total Peers	66.6%	22.1%	6.0%	5.3%	96,066
University of Maryland					
College Park	79.3%	15.4%	5.3%	- %	6,814
Baltimore City	39.6	23.8	1.5	35.1	1,547
Eastern Shore	96.0	4.0	-	-	126
Baltimore County	92.2	7.1	.7	-	708
University College	98.0	2.0	-	-	1,177
Total Maryland	76.6	14.4	3.8	5.2	10,372

Source: HEGIS Degrees and Other Formal Awards Conferred between July 1, 1981 and June 30, 1982

Table 4

University of Maryland and Designated Peers
Number of Merit Scholars
First Year Enrollment
Fall, 1982

University of California	
Berkeley	42
Davis	NR
San Diego	NR
University of Illinois	
Urbana-Champaign	51
University Center	NR
University of Michigan	
Ann Arbor	45
Dearborn	NR
Flint	NR
Michigan State	98
U. of North Carolina	
Chapel Hill	21
North Carolina State	15
University of Texas	
Austin	130
Texas A & M	190
University of Virginia	32
VPI	28
University of Wisconsin	
Madison	30
Milwaukee	NR
University of Maryland	
College Park	28
Baltimore County	NR
Eastern Shore	NR

NOTE: The number of merit scholars attending an institution is determined in part by the institution's policy regarding the allocation of funds for National Merit Scholarships.

Source: Chronicle of Higher Education, p. 12, February 10, 1983, Top 105 campuses in first-year enrollment of National Merit Scholars.

Table 5
Average SAT Scores of Entering Freshmen
University of Maryland and Designated Peers
Fall 1982

	Verbal	Math	Total
University of California			
Berkeley	553	585	1,138
Davis	494	555	1,049
San Diego	510	580	1,090
University of Illinois			
Urbana-Champaign	*	*	*
Medical Center	N/A	N/A	N/A
Chicago Circle	*	*	*
University of Michigan			
Ann Arbor	540	600	1,140
Dearborn	460	540	1,000
Flint	451	514	965
Michigan State	453	515	968
University of North Carolina			
Chapel Hill	510	552	1,062
North Carolina State	476	548	1,024
University of Texas			
Austin	484	547	1,031
Houston	N/A	N/A	N/A
A&M	486	517	1,003
University of Virginia	570	630	1,200
VPI	500	570	1,070
University of Wisconsin			
Madison	510	580	1,090
Milwaukee	453	523	976
University of Maryland			
College Park	463	519	982
Eastern Shore	338	369	707
Baltimore County	441	490	931
Baltimore City	N/A	N/A	N/A
University College	N/A	N/A	N/A

*Illinois uses ACT, not SAT; Urbana-Champaign's average 1982 score was 24.5.

Source: Barron's Profiles, Lovejoy's College Guide, and institutional personnel

College Park SAT scores for Fall, 1982 averaged 982, almost 100 points above the national average of 893. Scores at Baltimore County also exceeded the national average.

Among the peer institutions, the University of Michigan at Flint, Michigan State University, and the University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee were the only universities with average SAT scores below 1,000. The University of Virginia had the highest average score, 1,200, followed by the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, 1,140 and the University of California at Berkeley, 1,138. All scores are significantly above the national average, and indicate that these institutions attract a high calibre of student.

INSTITUTIONAL RESOURCES

A second area for comparative analysis is the array of resources an institution has assembled to support its primary goals and activities. For this study, the SBHE staff was able to accumulate data about faculty, academic programs, administrative salaries, facilities, libraries, academic computing, and federal research funding. Taken together this information provides a profile of peer institutions against which the University of Maryland can be compared.

Faculty

The single most important resource of a university is its faculty. In order to attract and retain the best qualified individuals the institution must offer competitive salaries and reasonable opportunities for promotion and tenure.

The most recent data (FY 1983) indicate that average faculty salaries at the University of Maryland for the ranks of professor, associate professor, and assistant professor are comparable to those of peers. (See Table 6) Faculty salaries at the rank of lecturer/instructor at the peer institutions are about 8.5 percent greater than at the University of Maryland. The all ranks average faculty salary at the University of Maryland is $29,257 compared with $32,515 among the peers. The total salary dollars expended at the University of Maryland would have to be increased about 11.0 percent to reach peer averages on all ranks basis. Most of this discrepancy is the result of differences in distribution of faculty by rank.

The University's relatively good standing compared to peer averages is the result of a 14 percent increase in salaries in FY 1983. For the University to maintain or improve its standing with respect to its peers in the area of faculty salaries, a sustained effort is required. In years in which no cost-of-living increases are awarded, the University loses ground rapidly in the competition to attract and retain the best faculty available.

Table 6
Average Faculty Salary by Rank
University of Maryland and Designated Peers
FY 1983

	Professor	Associate Professor	Assistant Professor	Lecturers/ Instructor	All Ranks
University of California					
Berkeley	$44,107	$29,456	$24,336	$23,941	$37,452
Davis	47,671	26,856	22,075	23,926	34,486
San Diego	40,718	27,780	23,010	22,994	33,940
Total California	44,270	28,172	23,361	23,824	35,955
University of Illinois					
Urbana-Champaign	$40,274	$28,228	$24,921	$22,169	$33,377
University Center	38,152	28,271	22,565	18,132	29,493
Health Science	38,575	28,337	23,114	17,319	27,042
Total Illinois	39,770	28,252	23,955	18,539	31,733
University of Michigan					
Ann Arbor	$42,202	$30,873	$25,335	$19,262	$34,714
Dearborn	31,929	24,822	20,751	16,933	24,772
Flint	33,609	26,841	22,055	17,047	25,948
Michigan State	37,103	27,862	23,638	19,820	31,513
Total Michigan	39,248	28,757	24,174	18,942	32,425
U. of North Carolina					
Chapel Hill	$40,561	$29,339	$23,092	$22,075	$32,338
North Carolina State	37,835	28,163	23,672	18,331	28,935
Total North Carolina	39,513	28,769	23,386	20,067	30,785
University of Texas					
Austin	$42,139	$29,756	$24,569	$21,422	$32,670
Health Science-Houston	44,635	32,917	26,096	20,240	33,104
Texas A&M	42,672	33,819	27,139	19,104	33,362
Total Texas	42,497	31,738	25,804	20,209	32,905
University of Virginia	$44,827	$30,742	$22,621	$20,299	$32,970
VPI	40,757	30,399	24,249	18,485	30,160
Total Virginia	42,655	30,534	23,637	18,991	31,287
University of Wisconsin					
Madison	$37,984	$27,301	$23,652	$21,226	$33,039
Milwaukee	38,317	27,993	23,272	20,168	29,606
Total Wisconsin	38,056	27,689	23,487	20,793	31,845
Total Peers	$40,834	$29,317	$24,201	$20,339	$32,515
University of Maryland					
College Park	$40,526	$29,332	$23,602	$18,653	$29,895
Baltimore City	42,613	32,631	25,963	18,553	29,330
Eastern Shore	29,111	27,745	24,813	21,285	24,223
Baltimore County	39,010	28,642	23,659	17,652	27,620
Total Maryland	40,510	29,651	24,214	18,752	29,257

NOTE: University College excluded because only 11 full-time faculty were reported and at only one rank were more that 2 individuals reported.
Source: HEGIS - Salaries, Tenure, and fringe Benefits of Full-Time Instructional Faculty, 1982-83

A comparison of the distribution of faculty by rank at the University of Maryland and the peers is provided in Table 7. The rank distribution at the University of Maryland is significantly different than that at peer institutions. The greatest difference is at the rank of professor. The proportion of faculty members holding the rank of professor at all peer institutions is 43.7 percent and at several individual campuses, the proportion exceeds 50 percent. At the University of Maryland, only 25.9 percent of the faculty hold the rank of professor, with College Park having 30.6 percent. Maryland also has a much greater percentage of its faculty at the instructor/lecturer rank (15.5 percent) than do peer institutions (6.9 percent).

The University of Maryland is also different from its peer institutions with regard to the proportion of the faculty holding tenure. More than 68 percent of the faculty at peer institutions have been awarded tenure compared to 59.1 percent at the University of Maryland. Because tenure is closely correlated with rank, it is to be expected that institutions with a higher proportion of their faculties at the rank of professor and associate professor would have higher tenure rates.

Differences in distribution of faculty by rank and tenure rates do not necessarily translate to differences in quality. These distributions are largely the result of individual institutional policy decisions. At this point the University of Maryland should have somewhat greater flexibility than its peer institutions to respond to shifts in demand for academic programs and to develop new areas because its faculty is less "locked in."

Faculty salaries are an important component of an institution's ability to attract and retain high quality faculty, but salaries are not a measure of faculty quality. Faculty reputation is an important indicator of institutional quality, but there is not a set of comparable data available for evaluating faculty across institutions. However, there are several reports currently available which provide rough indicators of faculty quality and performance in limited areas of the total responsibility of faculty members.

Table 7
Distribution of Faculty Salary by Rank and Percent Tenured
University of Maryland and Designated Peers
FY 1983

	Faculty	Prof.	Asso. Prof.	Assis. Prof.	Instructor/ Lecturers	Tenured
University of California						
Berkeley	1,428	62.1%	16.8%	14.7%	6.4%	77.9%
Davis	776	42.7	25.9	17.7	13.8	69.1
San Diego	496	55.6	22.6	16.5	5.2	76.8
Total California	2,700	55.3	20.5	15.9	8.3	75.2
University of Illinois						
Urbana-Champaign	2,068	49.3%	27.5%	22.6%	.6%	78.3%
University Center	837	32.6	35.0	28.9	3.5	74.2
Health Science	325	18.5	30.5	42.1	8.9	52.3
Total Illinois	3,230	42.1	29.9	26.4	1.6	75.1
University of Michigan						
Ann Arbor	1,693	51.8%	20.1%	20.3%	7.8%	69.8%
Dearborn	180	28.3	35.6	20.6	15.5	61.7
Flint	130	25.4	36.2	23.0	15.4	56.2
Michigan State	1,818	52.1	23.3	21.3	3.3	77.0
Total Michigan	3,821	49.9	22.9	20.9	6.3	72.4
U. of North Carolina						
Chapel Hill	1,089	44.4%	25.3%	20.9%	9.4%	66.9%
North Carolina State	914	33.1	28.3	25.7	12.9	59.4
Total North Carolina	2,003	39.2	26.7	23.1	11.0	63.5
University of Texas						
Austin	1,888	39.8%	25.6%	27.3%	7.3%	66.0%
Health Science-Houston	286	30.1	29.7	30.1	10.1	50.3
Texas A&M	1,506	32.1	27.4	30.5	10.0	53.3
Total Texas	3,680	35.9	26.7	28.8	8.6	59.6
University of Virginia	949	36.5%	29.4%	28.3%	5.8%	59.5%
VPI	1,417	27.9	30.5	31.5	10.1	58.0
Total Virginia	2,366	31.4	30.0	30.3	8.3	58.6
University of Wisconsin						
Madison	1,441	62.4%	15.1%	18.2%	4.3%	78.2%
Milwaukee	768	31.9	36.2	26.3	5.6	69.8
Total Wisconsin	2,209	51.8	22.4	21.0	4.8	75.3
Total Peers	20,009	43.7%	25.5%	23.9%	6.9%	68.6%
University of Maryland						
College Park	1,308	30.6%	30.7%	25.8%	12.9%	63.2%
Baltimore City	350	18.6	25.7	36.3	19.4	45.1
Eastern Shore	82	7.3	14.6	40.3	37.8	39.0
Baltimore County	273	18.3	42.5	23.1	16.1	59.1
Total Maryland	2,013	25.9	30.8	27.9	15.5	59.1

NOTE: University College excluded because only 11 full-time faculty were reported and at only one rank were more that 2 individuals reported.
Source: HEGIS - Salaries, Tenure, and fringe Benefits of Full-Time Instructional Faculty, 1982-83

In the area of research, the National Science Foundation compiles an annual report on federal support to universities, colleges, and selected non-profit institutions. While the federal government is not the only source of research support, it is by far the largest provider. Both the University of Maryland College Park and Baltimore City are among the top 100 universities receiving federal research and development funds nationally in Federal FY 1981. (See Table 8) College Park ranked 50th and Baltimore City ranked 60th among the top 100. Among public institutions in the top 100, College Park ranked 29th and Baltimore City ranked 36th of 67 institutions. Among the 17 peer campuses in the top 100, College Park ranked 11th and Baltimore City ranked 13th. These rankings indicate a high level of success on the part of University of Maryland faculty in competing for federal research dollars.

The National Institutes of Health has published a ranking of its grants to public medical schools for Federal FY 1982. The University of Maryland ranked 12th among 72 public medical schools receiving NIH extramural awards and 5th among 11 medical schools at peer institutions.(See Table 9) Again, this ranking indicates a high level of success among faculty competing for grants.

A second area in which comparative data are available is a recently completed study of the quality of research-doctorate programs sponsored by the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils and published by the National Academy of Sciences. The board includes representatives of the American Council of Learned Societies, the American Council on Education, the Social Science Research Council, and the National Research Council.

The study was quite complex and evaluated programs over a range of measures. Among the factors considered were the results of a reputational survey conducted in April, 1981. Faculty members within each discipline were asked to rate programs in the areas of faculty competence and achievements, the effectiveness of the program in educating research scholars and scientists, and improvement in the program over the past five years. The standardized scores in

Table 8

FEDERAL OBLIGATIONS FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT TO THE 100 UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES 1/ RECEIVING THE LARGEST AMOUNTS: FY 1974-81 2/

(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

RANK	INSTITUTION (RANKED BY AMOUNT RECEIVED FOR FY 1981)	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981
	TOTAL, ALL INSTITUTIONS	2,085,204	2,246,140	2,430,979	2,803,030	3,386,271	3,873,899	4,157,719	4,409,143
1	JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY	39,569	41,261	45,031	51,100	196,881	274,463	240,096	363,429
2	MASS INST OF TECHNOLOGY	61,074	68,715	68,146	91,953	114,705	110,681	142,094	146,035
3	STANFORD UNIVERSITY	53,565	58,665	62,824	73,685	80,805	94,030	104,610	106,073
4	UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON	54,909	60,235	62,296	69,882	76,500	88,332	100,577	99,965
5	UNIV OF CAL LOS ANGELES	53,402	54,203	58,724	63,573	69,878	87,367	87,296	95,210
*6	UNIV OF CAL SAN DIEGO	53,384	48,550	63,247	70,897	77,249	85,987	91,427	91,403
7	HARVARD UNIVERSITY	48,486	48,836	52,473	58,251	69,089	75,943	84,554	87,830
*8	UNIV OF WIS-MADISON	51,095	49,358	53,351	58,639	65,530	75,982	80,830	86,918
9	COLUMBIA UNIV MAIN DIV	46,054	48,565	50,889	60,518	65,264	74,183	81,511	83,659
10	UNIV OF PENNSYLVANIA	34,712	43,538	41,335	48,378	57,047	66,122	71,085	76,136
	TOTAL 1ST 10 INSTITUTIONS	500,250	521,926	558,316	646,876	872,948	1,032,890	1,084,080	1,236,658
*11	UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN	39,931	38,403	42,302	52,895	58,739	63,186	71,935	73,999
12	YALE UNIVERSITY	37,671	36,672	40,759	47,485	54,033	63,217	68,938	73,526
13	CORNELL UNIVERSITY	33,810	39,601	41,675	50,320	58,729	69,257	75,166	72,671
14	UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA	36,471	39,695	46,363	50,160	59,935	64,793	76,068	72,001
15	UNIV OF CAL SAN FRANCISCO	28,329	33,689	32,737	38,103	46,528	59,475	62,771	64,814
*16	UNIV OF CAL BERKELEY	44,090	40,797	45,739	45,094	50,477	54,800	50,427	64,065
17	WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY	28,753	30,719	31,363	37,861	42,260	48,364	52,529	54,170
18	UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO	33,217	38,300	42,343	46,046	49,239	50,924	50,592	53,992
*19	UNIV OF ILL URBANA	32,700	34,100	34,088	38,825	43,495	45,185	50,797	53,580
20	UNIV OF SOUTHERN CAL	23,493	26,678	38,717	37,739	42,908	50,179	48,343	49,221
	TOTAL 1ST 20 INSTITUTIONS	838,715	882,580	954,402	1,091,404	1,379,291	1,602,270	1,691,646	1,868,697
21	PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIV	17,754	20,256	21,953	23,019	42,106	44,257	48,463	47,099
22	UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO	22,628	22,338	26,084	30,059	32,198	36,049	44,823	46,146
23	DUKE UNIVERSITY	22,974	24,568	27,220	30,059	34,790	41,873	42,685	44,287
*24	UNIV OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN	21,169	23,307	21,553	29,142	37,352	37,913	40,434	43,756
25	UNIVERSITY OF ROCHESTER	21,250	25,408	23,574	26,491	33,813	35,427	41,324	42,983
26	OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY	19,642	20,913	21,875	25,304	34,177	33,673	37,312	42,899
27	YESHIVA UNIVERSITY	21,036	24,782	23,840	26,244	28,710	35,401	40,275	42,590
28	NEW YORK UNIVERSITY	27,719	28,029	33,104	35,726	38,283	38,987	39,494	40,636
29	UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH	18,774	18,586	19,484	21,577	26,086	31,522	33,246	38,512
*30	UNIV OF NC AT CHAPEL HILL	20,781	19,187	23,514	21,348	26,774	40,433	35,795	38,447
	TOTAL 1ST 30 INSTITUTIONS	1,052,442	1,109,954	1,196,603	1,360,373	1,713,580	1,977,805	2,095,497	2,296,052
31	UNIVERSITY OF UTAH	20,336	19,736	22,449	24,998	29,567	35,524	31,966	38,163
32	PURDUE UNIVERSITY	17,953	21,460	24,142	23,945	29,863	31,117	34,853	36,549
33	UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA	12,424	16,138	17,779	25,296	26,550	30,375	33,887	36,308
34	UNIVERSITY OF IOWA	18,549	16,645	17,640	21,537	24,551	33,284	34,677	35,300
35	BAYLOR COL OF MEDICINE	19,361	18,615	18,120	20,338	26,476	29,806	31,784	35,062
*36	TEXAS A & M UNIVERSITY	12,067	12,368	14,554	14,594	20,263	26,426	26,979	34,398
*37	MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY	14,371	18,003	17,997	20,179	21,921	27,394	28,836	34,000
38	CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIV	17,774	18,975	18,841	20,175	24,853	29,606	31,420	33,744
39	GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECH	6,747	9,455	12,621	19,243	22,253	24,146	27,868	33,116
40	CALIFORNIA INST OF TECH	19,807	21,002	22,221	25,085	26,235	31,680	35,552	32,959
	TOTAL 1ST 40 INSTITUTIONS	1,211,631	1,282,351	1,382,967	1,575,763	1,968,112	2,277,163	2,415,319	2,645,651
41	NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY	16,544	18,721	20,082	23,468	26,958	31,520	31,983	32,446
*42	UNIV OF CAL DAVIS	16,837	19,837	19,460	22,413	27,827	33,616	42,245	31,757
43	UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA	13,026	16,257	15,617	18,671	21,690	22,129	25,467	30,845
44	UNIV ALABAMA BIRMINGHAM	15,854	15,507	19,864	18,862	21,511	26,847	26,995	29,970
45	INDIANA UNIVERSITY	14,238	13,132	15,621	16,771	19,158	20,730	26,770	29,276
46	UNIVERSITY OF MIAMI	18,668	22,896	20,765	24,123	25,761	27,360	27,986	28,956
47	OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY	12,297	13,718	15,761	19,221	18,646	23,158	29,690	27,669
48	WOODS HOLE OCNGRPHIC INST	15,070	14,440	15,222	15,988	19,625	19,131	23,427	27,633
49	VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY	12,744	13,770	14,156	16,876	20,151	21,747	25,978	27,426
*50	UNIV OF MD COLLEGE PARK	11,746	13,772	16,034	18,535	19,401	21,049	26,463	27,313
	TOTAL 1ST 50 INSTITUTIONS	1,340,659	1,444,401	1,555,549	1,772,691	2,188,840	2,524,450	2,702,323	2,938,942

SEE FOOTNOTES AT END OF TABLE.

*Peer Institution

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 8

FEDERAL OBLIGATIONS FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT TO THE 100 UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES 1/ RECEIVING THE LARGEST AMOUNTS: FY 1974-81 2/

CONTINUED

(DOLLARS IN THOUSANDS)

RANK	INSTITUTION (RANKED BY AMOUNT RECEIVED FOR FY 1981)	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	1981
51	BOSTON UNIVERSITY	12,422	13,325	15,536	17,212	19,763	20,925	24,943	27,019
*52	UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA	11,325	12,049	14,319	17,436	19,151	22,686	23,583	24,333
53	U TEX HLTH SCI CTR DALLAS	10,290	10,662	11,474	15,688	16,084	20,270	22,172	23,911
54	PRINCETON UNIVERSITY	13,537	16,038	15,185	16,685	17,410	19,410	21,492	23,888
55	UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT	8,495	9,488	10,547	12,922	15,072	19,011	19,171	22,196
56	CARNEGIE-MELLON UNIV	7,097	10,014	10,761	13,449	13,973	16,562	22,082	21,915
57	COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY	13,588	16,110	17,003	18,990	21,019	21,429	22,262	21,487
58	UNIV OF HAWAII-MANOA	15,668	15,029	16,512	19,200	17,406	23,963	23,697	20,629
59	UNIV OF CAL IRVINE	8,609	8,920	9,574	10,330	11,922	13,847	18,605	20,614
*60	UNIV OF MD BALT PROF SCH	10,143	11,925	13,121	15,312	16,592	18,374	17,184	20,414
	TOTAL 1ST 60 INSTITUTIONS	1,471,633	1,567,981	1,689,581	1,929,915	2,357,232	2,720,907	2,917,516	3,165,348
61	ROCKEFELLER UNIVERSITY	10,916	12,065	12,894	15,371	17,473	17,163	19,686	19,952
62	U TENNESSEE KNOXVILLE	8,093	8,674	11,636	13,375	18,545	18,729	20,710	19,933
63	CUNY MT SINAI SCH OF MED	13,627	15,507	15,613	16,707	18,868	21,131	21,799	19,874
64	SUNY AT STONY BROOK	6,894	7,671	9,749	11,648	12,651	14,817	18,449	19,602
65	LOUISIANA STATE UNIV	7,960	7,980	8,565	10,085	13,886	14,719	19,214	19,005
66	UNIVERSITY OF NEW MEXICO	8,692	9,330	11,265	14,196	18,440	20,140	17,952	18,974
67	UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI	9,317	8,718	11,629	9,657	13,430	16,635	19,486	18,766
68	RUTGERS THE ST UNIV OF NJ	9,415	9,999	9,082	10,272	13,697	14,638	16,316	18,011
69	UNIV OF TEX CANCER CENTER	10,033	14,881	15,622	17,060	21,213	17,467	20,345	17,789
70	EMORY UNIVERSITY	9,724	12,067	13,750	12,257	12,921	14,304	16,028	17,374
	TOTAL 1ST 70 INSTITUTIONS	1,566,304	1,674,873	1,809,386	2,060,543	2,518,356	2,890,650	3,107,501	3,354,630
71	UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS	10,234	10,743	12,365	14,473	16,227	18,973	21,803	17,205
72	UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA	7,327	9,527	9,328	10,762	14,258	14,116	17,056	17,045
*73	N C STATE UNIV AT RALEIGH	7,725	8,363	8,501	11,488	11,606	15,696	22,378	16,758
74	VIRGINIA COMMONWLTH UNIV	5,267	5,720	7,298	9,415	11,368	14,339	15,605	16,713
*75	VA POLYTECH INST & ST U	6,591	7,836	8,349	9,966	14,507	16,204	16,823	16,449
76	SUNY AT BUFFALO	9,348	11,146	12,432	12,488	13,208	14,576	18,478	16,224
77	BROWN UNIVERSITY	7,527	8,086	9,764	9,988	11,789	13,758	15,681	16,020
78	TUFTS UNIVERSITY	6,097	6,524	5,797	6,749	7,742	9,799	9,853	15,642
79	UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY	8,464	7,836	8,135	7,187	8,015	10,985	9,807	15,412
80	UNIV OF MASS AT AMHERST	7,539	8,190	8,202	10,018	10,975	12,268	14,415	15,131
	TOTAL 1ST 80 INSTITUTIONS	1,642,423	1,758,844	1,899,557	2,163,077	2,698,051	3,031,364	3,269,400	3,517,229
81	UNIVERSITY OF DAYTON	5,697	6,306	6,643	10,690	12,222	14,795	15,314	15,049
82	TEMPLE UNIVERSITY	10,314	10,285	12,090	12,434	12,559	12,851	15,368	14,678
83	GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIV	9,532	10,511	9,439	13,512	13,028	15,314	13,608	14,503
84	UNIV OF MISSOURI COLUMBIA	8,959	9,426	9,784	12,519	13,676	14,502	14,467	14,477
85	U TEX HLTH SCI CTR S ANTO	2,720	3,012	4,892	5,781	7,384	9,586	11,153	13,314
*86	U TEX HLTH SCI CTR HOUSTN	7,267	2,782	8,711	5,584	8,768	12,422	11,282	12,987
87	UNIVERSITY OF NOTRE DAME	4,152	3,625	4,585	5,390	5,534	6,787	7,250	12,970
*88	UNIV OF ILL MED CTR CHGO	4,664	4,750	5,613	7,634	7,924	10,685	12,017	12,931
89	WASHINGTON STATE UNIV	4,783	6,049	6,436	7,870	8,959	10,154	13,162	12,896
90	UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY	7,585	7,977	8,757	10,210	12,067	13,421	13,982	12,875
	TOTAL 1ST 90 INSTITUTIONS	1,708,096	1,823,567	1,976,507	2,254,701	2,740,172	3,153,887	3,399,003	3,653,909
91	UNIV OF CAL SANTA BARBARA	3,467	4,537	4,824	6,728	8,372	8,764	10,946	12,688
92	WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY	5,465	6,276	7,626	10,342	10,495	12,199	11,926	12,582
93	UNIV OF VT & ST AGRIC COL	6,147	9,323	8,234	9,574	12,059	11,869	12,035	11,950
94	NEW MEXICO STATE UNIV	6,794	8,994	10,433	12,268	16,260	11,272	10,484	11,759
95	UNIV OF RHODE ISLAND	5,292	4,855	6,156	9,415	8,445	11,917	12,970	11,315
96	COL OF MED & DENT OF N J	4,847	4,830	5,744	6,347	7,658	9,081	8,970	11,115
97	UNIV OF NEBRASKA-LINCOLN	5,583	5,053	5,505	6,379	6,288	8,599	8,655	11,108
98	SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY	4,643	5,845	5,211	6,336	6,476	10,190	10,287	10,689
99	UNIV OF ALASKA FAIRBANKS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	20,144	18,768	17,908	10,679
100	DARTMOUTH COLLEGE	5,210	4,905	5,725	6,563	7,225	8,875	9,941	10,395
	TOTAL 1ST 100 INSTITUTIONS	1,755,944	1,878,185	2,035,965	2,328,655	2,843,594	3,265,421	3,513,125	3,768,389

1/ DOES NOT INCLUDE R&D OBLIGATIONS TO UNIVERSITY-ASSOCIATED FEDERALLY FUNDED RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT CENTERS (FFRDC'S). SEE TABLES B-46 AND B-48.

2/ SEE FOOTNOTE REFERENCE 1 AT END OF TABLE B-1.

NOTE: DATA FOR EACH YEAR REFLECT SUPPORT FROM THE AGENCIES INCLUDED IN THE SURVEY SYSTEM FOR THAT YEAR.

SOURCE: NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

*Peer Institution

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 9

SUMMARY OF NIH EXTRAMURAL AWARDS TO PUBLIC MEDICAL SCHOOLS
BY RANK OF INSTITUTION AND ACTIVITY
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDED SEPTEMBER 30, 1982

RANK	INSTITUTION	TOTAL AWARDS	
		NUMBER	AMOUNT
1	University of California, San Francisco	439	$55,746,756
2	University of Washington	332	43,556,595
3	University of California, Los Angeles	311	34,920,744
4	University of Minnesota, Minneapolis	258	28,948,310
*5	University of Michigan	232	28,948,310
*6	University of California, San Diego	233	25,659,613
7	University of Texas, Southwestern	218	25,015,325
*8	University of North Carolina	227	24,723,614
9	University of Iowa	208	24,297,998
*10	University of Wisconsin	185	24,269,052
11	University of Alabama	166	23,997,717
*12	UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND	116	18,996,932
13	University of Colorado	185	17,835,925
14	University of Utah	122	16,338,283
*15	University of Virginia	168	14,383,620
16	University of Texas, San Antonio	144	14,343,687
17	University of Cincinnati	105	13,590,701
18	Medical College of Virginia of VCU	139	13,375,263
19	University of Arizona	92	12,422,855
*20	University of Illinois	120	11,259,675
*21	University of Texas, Houston	124	9,888,867
22	University of Connecticut	111	9,815,213
23	Indiana University	94	9,528,922
24	University of Texas, Galveston	122	9,459,536
25	University of Florida	116	9,425,063
26	University of Vermont	70	9,095,587
27	Louisiana State University, New Orleans	70	9,055,776
28	University of Oregon	76	8,405,910
29	SUNY Stony Brook Health Science Center	93	8,004,408
30	University of Tennessee	84	7,911,937
31	Pennsylvania State University	85	7,821,256
32	Ohio State University	64	7,670,474
33	SUNY Buffalo	76	7,630,110
34	University of Massachussetts	68	7,032,326

Table 9 (continued)

35	Wayne State University	76	6,875,779
36	University of New Mexico	50	6,710,024
37	SUNY Downstate Medical Center	72	6,654,879
*38	University of California, Davis	75	6,477,804
39	Medical University of South Carolina	78	6,425,480
40	University of California, Irvine	73	5,796,805
41	University of Kansas	75	5,244,827
42	Univ. of Med. & Dent. of NJ, Newark	55	5,154,160
43	Medical College of Georgia	49	5,045,360
44	Univ. of Med. & Dent. of NJ, Rutgers	44	4,868,377
45	SUNY Upstate Medical Center	60	4,679,014
46	University of Mississippi	40	4,503,376
47	University of Missouri, Columbia	58	4,401,964
48	University of Kentucky	54	4,384,449
49	University of Nebraska	37	3,756,829
*50	Michigan State University	45	3,628,718
51	Medical College of Ohio at Toledo	36	3,181,699
52	University of South Alabama	43	3,070,697
53	University of Oklahoma	40	2,642,219
54	University of Puerto Rico	17	2,327,428
55	University of Louisville	33	2,225,269
56	University of South Florida	34	1,938,749
57	West Virginia University	30	1,912,375
58	University of Arkansas	33	1,895,716
59	University of HI John A. Burns School of Medicine	19	1,783,796
60	Texas Tech University	25	1,304,140
61	U. S. Uniformed Services University	31	1,288,514
62	Wright State University	8	990,521
63	University of South Carolina	14	957,360
*64	Texas A & M University	19	916,290
65	Louisiana State University, Shreveport	15	666,993
66	East Carolina University	11	568,584
67	Marshall University	8	519,276
68	Southern Illinois University	11	512,348
69	University of Nevada	10	479,886
70	University of North Dakota	8	477,158
71	University of South Dakota	8	249,512
72	East Tennessee State University	3	183,887

*Peer Institution SOURCE: National Institutes of Health

the area of faculty quality and achievements have been used to rank programs by many individuals reporting the findings of this study. While it is important to acknowledge the limitations of reputational surveys, the results can be used as an indicator of relative standing. Table 10 provides an overall ranking of faculty quality for the Univesity of Maryland-College Park and peers with rated programs. In this analysis, College Park ranks 10th among 16 peers. Because each campus is rated on a different number of graduate programs, it is also useful to compare College Park to peer institutions for each program offered at College Park. Tables 11-15 show the standardized scores and the rank order of rated programs. As can be seen in these tables, College Park faculty ranked high in Mathematics, Physics, Electrical Engineering and Economics, and compared favorably with rated peers in most disciplines. While these ratings are limited to faculty involved in research doctorate programs, it suggests that the quality of Maryland faculty is competitive with faculty at peer institutions.

Administrators

The administrative structure of universities varies considerably from institution to institution, making comparisons somewhat difficult. However, there is no question that highly competent administrators are an essential component of a high quality institution. As is the case with faculty, the institution must offer competitive salaries in order to attract and retain the best qualified individuals in administrative positions.

In the area of administrative salaries, the University of Maryland appears to lag somewhat behind its peers. The SBHE staff was unable to obtain administrative salaries for individual peer institutions because of concerns about releasing the salaries of readily identifiable individuals. Consequently, the staff requested that the College and University Personnel Association prepare a special tabulation using information reported by peer institutions in its annual survey. All but three campuses from the peer group had participated

Table 10

National Research Council Study of Doctoral Granting Institutions

University of Maryland - College Park

Rank Ordering with Peer Institutions
(Average of All Ranked Disciplines)

Category: Faculty Quality

Rank	Institution	Score	Number of Disciplines
1	Berkeley	66.7	37
2	Ann Arbor	61.6	30
3	Madison	60.5	34
4	Urbana	60.5	30
5	Austin	58.3	30
6	San Diego	57.2	23
7	UNC Chapel Hill	56.1	29
8	Davis	53.5	26
9	U of Virginia	52.6	26
10	College Park	51.4	25
11	U of Ill Chi Cir	50.6	9
12	Michigan State	50.5	28
13	VPI	49.3	16
14	NC State	47.7	18
15	Texas A&M	45.9	18
16	Milwaukee	44.1	11

Note: The faculty quality rankings were obtained from the National Academy of Sciences data by sorting the computer file into descending order on the faculty ranking raw score within discipline and counting the position from the first program listed.

Table 11

Standardized Scores and Rank Order of
Evaluations of Faculty Scholarly Competence and Achievement
University of Maryland and Peers

PHYSICAL SCIENCES AND MATHEMATICS

	Chemistry		Computer Science		Mathematics		Physics		Statistics	
	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R
University of California										
Berkeley	74	1	70	1	72	1	72	1	72	1
Davis	55	10			46	13	48	13		
San Diego	62	5	51	7	57	6	65	3		
University of Illinois										
Urbana-Champaign	69	2	63	2	63	4	67	2	57	4
University Center	47	14			54	8	44	15		
Health Science										
University of Michigan										
Ann Arbor	58	9			64	3	60	7	53	5
Dearborn										
Flint										
Michigan State	60	8	39	9	50	11	56	8	53	5
U. of North Carolina										
Chapel Hill	62	5	52	6	53	9	53	9	63	3
North Carolina State	45	15			44	14	45	14	53	5
University of Texas										
Austin	63	4	57	3	56	7	62	4		
Health Science-Houston							43	16	46	10
Texas A&M	61	7	35	10			50	12	53	5
University of Virginia	52	12	42	8	53	9	53	9		
VPI	48	13			47	12	52	11	51	9
University of Wisconsin										
Madison	69	2	57	3	65	2	61	5	66	2
Milwaukee	43	16			40	15	42	17		
University of Maryland										
College Park	54	11	56	5	58	5	61	5	37	11
TOTAL PROGRAMS RANKED	16		10		15		17		11	

S = Standarized Score
R = Rank
Source: Conference Board of Associated Research Councils Study of Research Doctoral Programs

Table 12

Standardized Scores and Rank Order of
Evaluations of Faculty Scholarly Competence and Achievement
University of Maryland and Peers

ENGINEERING

	Chemical Engineering		Civil Engineering		Electrical Engineering		Mechanical Engineering	
	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R
University of California								
Berkeley	71	2	75	1	75	1	73	1
Davis			55	7	49	10	53	6
San Diego					58	5		
University of Illinois								
Urbana-Champaign	64	3	72	2	73	2	63	3
University Center Health Science					45	12	50	9
University of Michigan								
Ann Arbor	57	5	61	4	64	3	65	2
Dearborn								
Flint								
Michigan State	42	10	47	10	50	8	49	10
U. of North Carolina								
Chapel Hill								
North Carolina State	50	6	54	8	49	10	53	6
University of Texas								
Austin	61	4	67	3	60	4	57	5
Health Science-Houston								
Texas A&M	48	7	56	6	45	12	46	13
University of Virginia	48	7	47	10	45	12	49	10
VPI			52	9	50	8	53	6
University of Wisconsin								
Madison	72	1	59	5	56	7	60	4
Milwaukee								
University of Maryland								
College Park	47	9	46	12	58	5	49	10
TOTAL PROGRAMS RANKED	10		12		14		13	

S = Standarized Score
R = Rank
Source: Conference Board of Associated Research Councils Study of Research Doctoral Programs

Table 13

Standardized Scores and Rank Order of
Evaluations of Faculty Scholarly Competence and Achievement
University of Maryland and Peers

SOCIAL SCIENCES

	Economics		Geography		History		Political Science		Psych		Sociology	
	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R
University of California												
Berkeley	65	1	66	1	71	1	71	1	69	2	69	2
Davis	53	11	45	9	53	10	47	11	48	12	52	9
San Diego	58	4			56	7	53	7	66	4	58	7
University of Illinois												
Urbana-Champaign	54	9	58	3	56	7	57	5	67	3	60	5
University Center Health Science					53	10			53	11	51	12
University of Michigan												
Ann Arbor	63	3	52	5	68	2	70	2	70	1	69	2
Dearborn												
Flint												
Michigan State	55	7	51	6	49	12	52	8	56	9	53	8
U. of North Carolina												
Chapel Hill	54	9	49	7	62	4	60	4	62	7	67	4
North Carolina State	47	14							42	15	40	14
University of Texas												
Austin	49	13	48	8	59	6	54	6	63	6	60	5
Health Science-Houston												
Texas A&M	52	12	44	11								
University of Virginia	56	6			60	5	52	8	58	8	52	9
VPI	55	7							47	13	41	13
University of Wisconsin												
Madison	65	1	66	1	65	3	66	3	64	5	70	1
Milwaukee	43	15	53	4			46	12	44	14		
University of Maryland												
College Park	58	4	45	9	54	9	51	10	54	10	52	9
TOTAL PROGRAMS RANKED		15		11		12		12		15		14

S = Standarized Score
R = Rank
Source: Conference Board of Associated Research Councils Study of Research Doctoral Programs

Table 14

Standardized Scores and Rank Order of
Evaluations of Faculty Scholarly Competence and Achievement
University of Maryland and Peers

HUMANITIES

	Art History		English		French		Music		Spanish	
	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R
University of California										
Berkeley	64	1	71	1	61	2	67	1	67	2
Davis			51	12	53	7			47	10
San Diego			56	8			41	8	62	5
University of Illinois										
Urbana-Champaign			58	7	60	4	63	2	59	6
University Center										
Health Science										
University of Michigan										
Ann Arbor	58	2	61	3	61	2	62	3	65	3
Dearborn										
Flint										
Michigan State			54	10	46	9	40	9	45	11
U. of North Carolina										
Chapel Hill	53	3	60	4	54	6	60	4	55	7
North Carolina State										
University of Texas										
Austin	45	6	59	6	53	7	54	5	69	1
Health Science-Houston										
Texas A&M			42	13						
University of Virginia	50	4	70	2	62	1			53	8
VPI										
University of Wisconsin										
Madison	41	7	60	4	56	5	48	6	63	4
Milwaukee			52	11						
University of Maryland										
College Park	49	5	56	8	43	10	48	6	53	8
TOTAL PROGRAMS RANKED	7		13		10		9		11	

S = Standarized Score
R = Rank
Source: Conference Board of Associated Research Councils Study of Research Doctoral Programs

Table 15

Standardized Scores and Rank Order of
Evaluations of Faculty Scholarly Competence and Achievement
University of Maryland and Peers

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

	Biochemistry		Microbiology		Botony		Zoology	
	S	R	S	R	S	R	S	R
University of California								
Berkeley	71	1	58	7	65	3	70	1
Davis	61	6	64	3	68	1	58	4
San Diego	66	3	68	1				
University of Illinois								
Urbana-Champaign	62	4	60	6				
University Center								
Health Science								
University of Michigan								
Ann Arbor	62	4	62	5	64	4		
Dearborn								
Flint								
Michigan State	57	7	57	8	60	6	53	7
U. of North Carolina								
Chapel Hill	56	8	60	6	58	9	58	4
North Carolina State	45	12	49	14	59	8	47	9
University of Texas								
Austin	54	10	56	9	68	1	65	3
Health Science-Houston	53	11	53	12				
Texas A&M	45	12	31	16	45	11	38	11
University of Virginia	55	9	56	9				
VPI	41	16	54	11	45	11	51	8
University of Wisconsin								
Madison	71	1	62	4	64	4	66	2
Milwaukee					38	13	40	10
University of Maryland								
College Park	42	15	52	13	47	10	56	6
Baltimore City	45	12	41	15				
TOTAL PROGRAMS RANKED		16		16		13		11

S = Standarized Score
R = Rank
Source: Conference Board of Associated Research Councils Study of Research Doctoral Programs

in the Fall 1982 survey. The three not included were University of California-Davis, North Carolina State University, and University of Texas-Health Science Center at Houston. Table 16 compares average salaries for twenty-three administrative positions at the University of Maryland with median salaries at the peer institutions and at a larger sample of public universities enrolling 20,000 or more students. As can be seen from this table, administrative salaries at the University of Maryland are consistently and substantially below medians for the peer group and the larger group of public universities.

Academic Programs

The array of academic programs offered by an institution provides the most straightforward evidence of the range of instructional opportunities the institution is providing to its students. Tables 17, 18, and 19 show the distribution of degrees awarded by the University of Maryland compared to peers at the bachelors, masters, and doctoral level. Because of the diversity in program titles and options, the program classification used for this comparison is the HEGIS taxonomy used by NCES. A new taxonomy is being implemented and should be fully in place for the 1983 reports. In 1982, institutions were given the option of using the new or the old taxonomy in reporting degrees awarded. Among the University of Maryand and its peers, only institutions in Michigan and Virginia used the new taxonomy, so the comparisons are based on the old taxonomy with data from those two states excluded.

At the bachelor's degree level, the distribution of degrees awarded by program area at the University of Maryland is similar to that of the peer group as a whole. The areas which show the greatest differences are Engineering, where the University of Maryand awards a smaller proportion of its total degrees than do peers and Health Professions, where the University awards a higher proportion of its degrees than do peers. When comparisons are made to individual peer states, there is greater variation, but the largest differences in most cases are situations unique to the individual system. For example, the University of California awards a much higher proportion of degrees in

Table 16

Comparative Administrative Salaries
by CUPA Position Title

University of Maryland and Peers
1982-83

		Average Salary by Position University of Maryland	Median Salary by Position Designated Peers	2 ÷ 1 Percent Difference	Median Salary by Position Public Universities Enrolling 20,000+	4 ÷ 1 Percent Difference
01	Chief Executive (Multi-Campus System)	$80,358	$84,347	5.0%	$80,358	.0%
02	Chief Executive (Single-Campus System)	71,460	80,000	14.0	76,000	8.3
03	Executive Vice President	72,575	-	-	65,174	(10.2)
04	Chief Academic Affairs	55,779	73,000	31.6	69,480	25.3
05	Chief Business Affairs	53,251	65,750	23.5	61,800	16.1
06	Chief Student Affairs	48,099	55,472	15.3	57,000	18.5
07	Chief Development	41,488	55,000	32.6	52,760	27.2
08	Chief Public Relations	34,075	43,200	26.8	45,000	32.1
10	Chief Personnel	41,718	45,600	9.3	43,800	5.0
12	Chief Budget	37,044	46,400	25.3	46,640	25.9
13	Director Legal Services	43,400	51,558	18.8	52,500	21.0
14	Registrar	36,435	42,998	18.0	40,100	10.1
17	Director Libraries	43,351	56,400	30.1	54,000	24.6
18	Director Computer Center	43,817	50,000	14.1	51,400	17.3
20	Director Institutional Research	32,941	35,500	7.8	38,044	15.5
22	Administrator Grants and Contracts	34,995	37,400	6.9	44,976	28.5
23	Director of Affirmative Action	32,453	32,800	1.1	36,500	12.5
25	Controller	42,905	52,400	22.1	48,800	13.7
29	Chief Physical Plant	44,475	50,000	12.4	47,050	5.8
30	Director of Purchasing	31,764	36,100	13.7	37,296	17.4
32	Director of Campus Secutiry	34,623	39,120	13.0	39,264	13.4
36	Director of Admissions	30,608	39,690	29.7	37,900	23.8
39	Director of Financial Aid	29,717	36,175	21.7	37,500	26.2

*Mean salary data for all campuses have been used to avoid reporting individual salaries. Data are not available to calculate mean salaries for peer institutions or CUPA groupings.

SOURCE: College and University Personnel Association

Table 17

Bachelor's Degrees Awarded 1981-82

Percent by Discipline

	University of Maryland*	All Peers	California	Illinois	Michigan	North Carolina	Texas	Virginia	Wisconsin
01 Agriculture and Natural Resource	4.2	5.4	6.3	3.9		5.9	5.6		5.1
02 Architecture and Environmental Design	.9	2.7	3.7	3.1		1.2	3.0		1.9
03 Area Studies	.5	.4	.4	.1		1.1	.3		.3
04 Biological Sciences	4.6	6.7	12.7	6.4		5.6	3.9		4.7
05 Business and Management	14.3	16.0	3.8	16.9	N	19.7	25.1	N	12.8
06 Communications	4.5	4.8	2.1	2.5	O	4.5	7.8	O	6.2
07 Computer and Information Sciences	3.6	2.2	2.4	1.8	T	1.5	2.5	T	2.3
08 Education	6.9	5.3	.7	5.7		4.1	7.5		7.8
09 Engineering	8.3	15.9	12.3	19.1		14.9	18.9		12.5
10 Fine and Applied Arts	2.9	3.0	3.8	3.7	A	1.0	2.1	A	4.2
11 Foreign Languages	.9	1.2	1.7	1.2	V	.6	.9	V	1.5
12 Health Professions	10.9	6.7	.9	8.5	A	8.7	6.5	A	10.7
13 Home Economics	5.6	1.4	1.0	1.9	I	-	1.4	I	2.4
14 Law	-	-	.2	-	L	-	-	L	-
15 Letters	2.8	3.9	6.7	3.6	A	4.9	1.6	A	4.0
16 Library Science	-	-	-	-	B	-	-	B	-
17 Mathematics	.8	1.3	1.5	2.3	L	1.7	.5	L	.8
19 Physical Sciences	2.2	2.8	3.6	2.2	E	4.1	2.3	E	2.2
20 Psychology	4.0	4.0	6.1	4.9		3.4	2.7		3.3
21 Public Affairs and Service	3.7	1.8	.8	1.5		3.6	.8		3.5
22 Social Sciences	13.8	12.0	22.6	9.3		12.3	5.5		12.3
49 Interdisciplinary Studies	4.5	2.5	6.7	1.5		1.0	1.0		2.2
TOTAL DEGREES	6,789	43,948	9,544	8,781		5,788	12,380		7,455

NOTE: University College excluded because all degrees awarded are classified as Interdisciplinary Studies.

SOURCE: HEGIS - Degrees and Other Formal Awards Conferred Between July 1, 1981 and June 30, 1982.

11/23/83j

Table 18

Master's Degrees Awarded 1981-82

Percent by Discipline

	University of Maryland*	All Peers	California	Illinois	Michigan	North Carolina	Texas	Virginia	Wisconsin
01 Agriculture and Natural Resource	2.3	4.8	6.1	3.0		3.9	7.0		4.1
02 Architecture and Environmental Design	-	3.9	4.8	4.4		4.2	4.3		1.9
03 Area Studies	.6	.5	.5	.4		-	1.1		.4
04 Biological Sciences	4.4	3.6	5.1	2.6		6.4	2.0		2.8
05 Business and Management	8.2	13.6	11.5	11.6	N	10.2	18.1	N	16.0
06 Communications	2.2	1.2	.3	1.1	O	1.1	2.1	O	1.5
07 Computer and Information Sciences	1.8	2.7	2.7	1.6	T	2.0	2.4	T	4.6
08 Education	20.7	13.9	2.9	19.5		16.3	13.0		17.9
09 Engineering	6.9	14.8	23.5	14.1		7.9	16.9		9.1
10 Fine and Applied Arts	2.4	3.5	4.3	3.9	A	2.4	2.3	A	4.1
11 Foreign Languages	1.0	1.3	1.7	.9	V	1.2	.7	V	1.7
12 Health Professions	8.8	9.1	7.2	8.3	A	16.4	10.1	A	6.6
13 Home Economics	2.7	.4	.3	.7	I	-	.3	I	.5
14 Law	.2	.5	1.3	.6	L	-	.2	L	.1
15 Letters	1.1	3.4	3.5	4.6	A	5.1	2.0	A	2.2
16 Library Science	7.1	2.8	2.1	2.4	B	2.5	3.3	B	3.7
17 Mathematics	1.0	1.4	2.0	1.8	L	1.4	.6	L	1.1
19 Physical Sciences	2.2	4.2	4.5	4.1	E	3.5	4.6	E	3.8
20 Psychology	2.4	.9	.7	1.1		1.0	.9		.6
21 Public Affairs and Service	17.1	7.1	3.4	8.9		9.1	4.6		10.0
22 Social Sciences	6.8	5.3	6.6	4.4		3.8	3.5		7.3
49 Interdisciplinary Studies	-	1.3	4.7	-		1.5	.1		-
TOTAL DEGREES	1,470	13,596	2,985	3,197		1,752	2,605		3,057

NOTE: University College excluded because all degrees awarded are classified as Interdisciplinary Studies.

SOURCE: HEGIS - Degrees and Other Formal Awards Conferred Between July 1, 1981 and June 30, 1982.

Table 19

Doctorate Degrees Awarded 1981-82

Percent by Discipline

	University of Maryland*	All Peers	California	Illinois	Michigan	North Carolina	Texas	Virginia	Wisconsin
01 Agriculture and Natural Resource	3.1	5.3	2.4	5.7		7.5	6.7		6.2
02 Architecture and Environmental Design	-	.4	1.0	-		-	.7		-
03 Area Studies	1.5	.2	.3	-		-	.4		.1
04 Biological Sciences	11.0	16.3	22.0	12.3		23.4	6.5		16.4
05 Business and Management	.8	2.4	1.2	3.4	N	3.7	3.2	N	1.5
06 Communications	-	.9	-	.7	O	.2	2.1	O	1.8
07 Computer and Information Sciences	2.3	1.1	.7	1.6	T	.4	1.9	T	1.0
08 Education	33.7	14.5	4.7	16.5		13.5	23.8		18.7
09 Engineering	5.9	11.8	15.0	15.2		7.5	10.0		8.6
10 Fine and Applied Arts	2.3	1.7	1.9	2.6	A	.8	2.2	A	.7
11 Foreign Languages	1.3	1.8	1.2	1.0	V	1.5	1.8	V	3.4
12 Health Professions	2.0	4.6	1.4	4.7	A	5.0	9.4	A	4.1
13 Home Economics	-	.1	-	.4	I	-	-	I	.1
14 Law	-	-	.1	-	L	-	-	L	-
15 Letters	3.6	4.8	5.6	3.1	A	6.2	3.9	A	5.4
16 Library Science	.8	.3	.4	.6	B	.2	.1	B	.3
17 Mathematics	2.8	3.4	4.1	3.1	L	4.4	1.9	L	3.3
19 Physical Sciences	9.7	14.8	19.2	15.5	E	9.8	14.0	E	11.6
20 Psychology	6.1	3.1	3.1	4.5		5.6	2.6		1.7
21 Public Affairs and Service	3.1	1.1	1.0	2.0		-	1.5		.4
22 Social Sciences	10.2	9.4	11.3	6.9		10.2	5.8		12.1
49 Interdisciplinary Studies	-	1.8	3.6	-		.2	1.3		2.5
TOTAL DEGREES	392	3,685	1,075	683		482	720		725

NOTE: University College excluded because all degrees awarded are classified as Interdisciplinary Studies.

SOURCE: HEGIS - Degrees and Other Formal Awards Conferred Between July 1, 1981 and June 30, 1982.

11/23/83j

Biological Sciences and Social Sciences than the University of Maryland and a much lower percentage in Education and Business. These difference in California hold when compared to other peer systems as well. Texas is higher than all the other systems in the area of Business. Texas and Illinois award a high proportion of total bachelor's degrees in Engineering. These differences reflect to a large extent differences in curricular emphases at different institutions. On the whole, however, the similarities between the University of Maryland and the peers are greater than the differences at the bachelor's level.

Greater variations in degrees awarded by discipline are to be expected at the graduate level. Because fewer degrees are awarded, a relatively small number of degrees can change a percentage substantially. Institutions also tend to concentrate resources more and emphasize a more limited number of programs at the graduate level. Comparisons of individual institutions would show more diversity than is apparent in reviewing consolidated groupings.

At the master's level Maryland awards degrees in a generally similar pattern to peers. The largest differences are in the field of Education and Public Affairs and Service, where the University awarded a significantly higher proportion of degrees than peers, and Engineering and Business, where the University awarded a lower proportion than did peers.

At the doctoral level greater variation is observed between the University and its peers. One-third of the doctoral degrees awarded at the University of Maryand are in the field of education. This is a much higher proportion than any peers. The University awards fewer degrees proportionately than peers in the areas of Biological and Physical Sciences and Engineering.

Libraries

A critical resource for the support of academic programs is the library. A university cannot compete with the top institutions in the country with inadequate library resources.

Table 20 displays information on the libraries at the University of Maryland and at its designated peer campuses for whom information was published by the Association of Research Libraries. Table 21 displays library data per full-time equivalent student so that meaningful comparisons can be made.

The Association of Research Libraries has developed a composite ranking of the libraries at institutions of higher education that assigns various weights to volumes held, volumes added, spending for materials and salaries and the number of current serials in the library collection. Table 20 also gives the ARL rank for the libraries. The University of Maryland at College Park's library was ranked 41 by ARL, while the library at the University of California at Berkeley was rated second. Three other libraries at campuses of the designated peers were ranked in the top ten.

When the data per student are examined, the University of Maryland at College Park expended $217 per full-time equivalent student (FTES) while the peer institutions expended $361 per FTES for the Library. For salaries of library employees, the peer institutions expended $204 per student while College Park expended only $128 per student. The peer institutions, on the average, added four volumes per These data, on the whole, indicate that in every category the University of Maryland was at a level about half of its peers.

TABLE 20
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AND ITS DESIGNATED PEERS
LIBRARIES
1981-1982

	VOLUMES IN LIBRARY	VOLUMES ADDED	CURRENT SERIALS	SPENDING FOR MATERIALS	SPENDING FOR SALARIES	TOTAL HEGIS EXPENDITURES	ARL* RANK
CALIFORNIA:							
BERKELEY	6,117,424	189,651	102,265	169,260	11,670,545	19,831,116	2.
DAVIS	1,753,213	71,668	45,207	3,002,697	4,946,113	10,676,547	25.
SAN DIEGO	1,507,875	48,270	27,904	2,248,442	4,264,153	8,399,483	41.
SUBTOTAL, CALIFORNIA	9,378,512	309,589	175,376	9,420,399	20,880,811	38,907,146	
ILLINOIS:							
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN	6,242,615	151,490	93,913	4,019,841	6,666,517	11,685,498	9.
SUBTOTAL, ILLINOIS	6,242,615	151,490	93,913	4,019,841	6,666,517	11,685,498	
MICHIGAN:							
ANN ARBOR	5,481,172	105,482	60,688	3,677,902	7,516,157	13,292,820	8.
MICHIGAN STATE	2,807,156	92,929	20,301	2,296,850	3,917,646	6,125,974	35.
SUBTOTAL, MICHIGAN	8,288,328	198,411	80,989	5,974,752	11,433,803	19,418,794	
NORTH CAROLINA:							
UNC - CHAPEL HILL	2,839,858	117,059	39,593	3,520,990	4,945,302	10,284,105	16.
SUBTOTAL, N. CAROLINA	2,839,858	117,059	39,593	3,520,990	4,945,302	10,284,105	
TEXAS:							
A AND M	1,403,513	45,293	15,223	1,983,573	2,609,301	5,958,566	59.
U T - AUSTIN	4,846,764	144,642	60,000	4,847,047	7,587,294	10,372,515	7.
SUBTOTAL, TEXAS	6,250,277	189,935	75,223	6,830,620	10,196,595	16,331,081	
VIRGINIA:							
U. OF VIRGINIA	2,466,753	75,163	25,003	2,693,004	4,415,944	8,682,418	23.
VPI	1,334,979	49,364	21,635	2,117,884	2,605,973	6,570,122	57.
SUBTOTAL, VIRGINIA	3,801,732	124,527	46,638	4,810,888	7,021,917	15,252,540	
WISCONSIN:							
MADISON	4,184,038	104,191	53,836	3,352,060	6,815,220	12,289,341	12.
SUBTOTAL, WISCONSIN	4,184,038	104,191	53,836	3,352,060	6,815,220	12,289,341	
PEER TOTAL	40,985,360	1,195,202	565,568	37,929,550	67,960,165	124,168,505	
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND:							
COLLEGE PARK	1,516,990	44,959	19,632	2,199,359	3,951,840	6,722,941	41.

* ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES
SOURCE: A.R.L.

TABLE 21
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AND DESIGNATED PEERS
LIBRARY DATA PER FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT STUDENT

	VOLUMES IN LIBRARY	VOLUMES ADDED	CURRENT SERIALS	SPENDING FOR MATERIALS	SPENDING FOR SALARIES	TOTAL HEGIS EXPENDITURES
CALIFORNIA:						
BERKELEY	212	7	4	145	405	689
DAVIS	97	4	2	165	272	588
SAN DIEGO	127	4	2	190	360	709
SUBTOTAL, CALIFORNIA	159	5	3	160	355	662
ILLINOIS:						
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN	190	5	3	122	203	355
SUBTOTAL, ILLINOIS	190	5	3	122	203	355
MICHIGAN:						
ANN ARBOR	168	3	2	113	230	407
MICHIGAN STATE	73	2	1	60	102	159
SUBTOTAL, MICHIGAN	116	3	1	84	161	273
NORTH CAROLINA:						
UNC-CHAPEL HILL	147	6	2	182	255	531
SUBTOTAL, N. CAROLINA	147	6	2	182	255	531
TEXAS:						
A AND M	44	1	0	62	81	185
UT - AUSTIN	110	3	1	110	172	235
SUBTOTAL, TEXAS	82	2	1	89	133	214
VIRGINIA:						
U OF VIRGINIA	157	5	2	171	280	551
VPI	63	2	1	100	123	309
SUBTOTAL, VIRGINIA	103	3	1	130	190	412
WISCONSIN:						
MADISON	112	3	1	90	183	330
SUBTOTAL, WISCONSIN	112	3	1	90	183	330
PEER TOTAL	123	4	2	114	204	373
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND:						
COLLEGE PARK	49	1	1	71	128	217

SOURCE: ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Computer Support

The adequacy of computer support is becoming increasingly important in almost every discipline. Unfortunately, comparable data about levels of computer support are not generally available.

Table 22 presents information on academic computing centers at several of the institutions designated as peers of the University of Maryland. Data were available only for the University of California at Berkeley, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the University of Michigan, Michigan State University, the University of Texas at Austin, and Virginia Polytechnic. These data show that, in terms of state support per student for academic computing, College Park expends less than any of the peer institutions for whom data were available. Among the peer institutions, VPI expended the most among these schools ($190 per student) while Michigan State expended the least ($80) as compared with expenditures of $69 per student at College Park. When the data related to disk space per student and terminals per 1,000 students are examined, the University of Maryland at College Park is far behind any of its peers.

Physical Facilities

Another major indicator of support for institutional programs is the adequacy of the physical facilities. There can be considerable variation in the requirements for facilities depending upon the specific activities and programs being undertaken by the institution. While square footage alone does not guarantee the adequacy or quality of facilities, insufficient space can be a serious hindrance to an institution's performance of its functions in instruction, research, and public service.

TABLE 22

ACADEMIC COMPUTING CENTERS
COMPARATIVE DATA, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND PEERS

	STATE SUPPORT PER STUDENT	DISK SPACE PER STUDENT (in megabytes)	TERMINALS PER 1000 STUDENTS
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA BERKELEY	$138	.82	69
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS URBANA-CHAMPAIGN	$114	.65	17*
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN	$121	.31	29
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY	$ 80	.50	13
UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AUSTIN	$101	.32	43
VPI	$190	.63	80
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND COLLEGE PARK	$ 69	.22	11

*Does not include PLATO terminals.

Source: Profiles of Academic Computing , Oregon State University, 1982.

Table 23 displays information on the gross square feet (GSF) in auxiliary and non-auxiliary facilities on the campuses of the University of Maryland and those designated peers for whom information was available. Auxiliary space is that used for self-supporting programs and is largely composed of dormitories, dining halls, and student unions. Non-auxiliary space consists of the classrooms, research labs, offices, and other academic space at an institution.

Table 23 also includes information on the number of non-auxiliary GSF per FTES. The average number of non-auxiliary GSF per FTES for the peer institutions (279 GSF/FTES) exceeded the average at the University of Maryland (202 GSF/FTES) by almost 40 percent. College Park had less nonauxiliary space per student than did any of the peer institutions for whom data were available.

Table 23

Campus Facilities - Gross Square Feet
University of Maryland and Designated Peers

	Non-Auxiliary GSF	Auxiliary GSF	Total GSF	Non-Aux. GSF/FTES
University of California				
Berkeley	8,080,000	N/A	N/A	281
Davis	5,436,827	2,222,573	7,659,400	299
University of Illinois				
Urbana-Champaign	9,739,588	3,452,471	13,192,059	296
Medical Center	3,686,711	443,831	4,130,542	929
Chicago Circle	3,300,878	0	3,300,878	194
University of Michigan				
Ann Arbor	10,297,834	9,332,799	19,630,633	315
U. of North Carolina				
Chapel Hill	3,816,889	1,757,700	5,574,589	197
North Carolina State	4,498,112	1,532,525	6,030,637	257
University of Texas				
A&M	9,754,457	1,082,424	10,836,881	303
Austin	10,707,593	2,440,001	12,947,594	242
University of Wisconsin				
Madison	11,831,820	3,434,944	15,266,764	315
Milwaukee	3,469,491	1,095,286	4,564,777	188
Average, Designated Peers	84,620,200	26,794,554		279
University of Maryland				
College Park	5,006,531	3,417,307	8,423,838	162
Baltimore City	1,963,836	209,231	2,173,067	464
Eastern Shore	365,819	273,963	639,782	371
Baltimore County	1,093,379	459,962	1,553,341	195
Average, University of Maryland				202

Source: Institutional Reports

FINANCIAL RESOURCES AND EXPENDITURE PATTERNS

The most important determinant of an institution's ability to provide all of the resources necessary to support high quality programs is the level of financial support available to the institution. Financial comparisons between and among higher education institutions are not simple because of substantial differences in methods of budgeting and accounting used by institutions. In the case of public institutions, budgeting practices and policies required by the state government can further complicate comparisons. For example, fringe benefits are not always funded through the institutional budget, but sometimes handled through central state organizations. One cannot be as confident of estimates of fringe benefits costs in these instances. Further, because of differences in fringe benefits programs offered by the institutions, even if the information is accurate comparisons may not be completely valid.

The source of data used to compare expenditures and revenues was the HEGIS Financial Statistics of Institutions of Higher Education for FY 1982. Because of the complexity of financial comparisons, the staff invested considerable effort in attempting to understand reporting differences among peer institutions and between peers and the University of Maryland. Based on these discussions the SBHE staff has a high level of confidence in the validity of aggregate comparisons between the University of Maryland and its peers. Financial information for CEES, CES, and AES have been included in the University of Maryland totals because these activities are reported as part of individual campuses at peer institutions. The University of Maryland estimated the State's fringe benefit expenditures and has included them in its HEGIS forms. With these adjustments, the SBHE staff is certain that University of Maryland expenditures and revenues are not understated compared to peers.

Revenues and Expenditures

Table 24 displays information on FY 1982 HEGIS revenues for the institutions that were included in this study, while Table 25 displays information on the FY 1982 HEGIS expenditures. Tables 24 and 25 are derived from columns A and B of the HEGIS finance form. Wide variations exist in the total revenues and expenditures, and in the expenditures by program and revenues by source among institutions. These differences are attributable in part to differences in size among the institutions, as well as differences in programs and levels of support from various sources. It should be noted the data from Texas are somewhat underestimated because only a small part of the fringe benefit expenditures are included.

To enable comparisons to be made, the revenue and expenditure data were divided by total full-time equivalent students (FTES) at each campus. FTES were calculated from HEGIS enrollment reports by adding the headcount full-time enrollment to one-third of the headcount part-time enrollment for each institution. The FTES for California may be slightly understated because it cannot be determined whether all of the continuing education students analagous to those at University College have been included in the HEGIS enrollment report but the expenditures for these students are included in the Financial Report; therefore expenditures per FTES for California may be somewhat overstated. Data on revenues per FTES are displayed in Table 26 and data on expenditures per FTES are displayed in Table 27.

Among the designated peers, total revenues per student varied from $8,881 for Wisconsin institutions to $15,887 for California institutions and averaged $10,653. At the University of Maryland, revenues per FTES averages $8,416. The peer average exceeds the revenues per FTES at the University of Maryland by more than 26 percent.

TABLE 24
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AND ITS DESIGNATED PEERS
FY 1982 TOTAL REVENUES BY SOURCE

INSTITUTION	TUITION AND FEES	FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS	STATE APPROPRIATIONS	GRANTS AND CONTRACTS FEDERAL UNRESTRICTED	GRANTS AND CONTRACTS FEDERAL RESTRICTED	STATE UNRESTRICTED	STATE RESTRICTED	LOCAL UNRESTRICTED	LOCAL RESTRICTED	PRIVATE UNRESTRICTED	PRIVATE RESTRICTED	ENDOWMENTS	TOTAL
CALIFORNIA:													
BERKELEY	47,172,423	1,366,127	200,403,681	13,356,869	70,207,987	397,107	9,975,211	21,403	163,296	875,960	15,263,443	0	359,203,427
DAVIS	26,205,845	2,411,887	145,586,089	8,252,590	38,882,315	522,683	8,957,635	3,733	7,952,630	1,637,228	13,054,519	0	270,966,954
SAN DIEGO	19,920,517	0	102,416,918	10,087,823	99,882,383	143,522	5,116,503	9,298	1,659,699	1,262,333	13,600,123	0	260,098,214
CENTRAL*	7,111,100	3,779,719	11,373,296	66,957	9,144,198	25,353	868,564	189	12,108	2,430	542,992	16,155,414	44,082,218
SUBTOTAL, CALIFORNIA	100,409,885	7,557,733	479,779,984	35,764,139	213,116,883	1,088,665	24,917,913	34,623	9,287,726	3,777,951	42,461,077	16,155,414	934,350,813
ILLINOIS:													
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN	29,432,294	14,106,479	176,832,983	15,944,939	50,437,335	716,892	6,567,338	0	0	991,707	20,422,072	1,742,278	317,194,317
MEDICAL CENTER	7,253,941	1,683,049	104,947,566	8,911,986	13,221,869	23,242	2,933,423	0	0	235,735	7,190,280	474,629	142,875,720
CHICAGO CIRCLE	16,269,251	0	97,187,824	2,548,506	8,086,489	101,325	472,203	0	0	195,736	2,137,702	19,830	87,018,866
CENTRAL	1,042,092	0	19,645,398	303,991	737,578	4,840	447,200	0	0	88,164	472,204	46,298	22,787,566
SUBTOTAL, ILLINOIS	53,997,578	15,789,528	358,613,771	23,709,422	72,483,272	846,099	10,420,164	0	0	1,511,342	30,222,258	2,283,035	569,876,469
MICHIGAN:													
ANN ARBOR	117,747,771	390,625	159,853,702	25,543,831	81,836,897	160,560	1,295,811	141	1,487,858	4,287,971	31,132,526	9,349,530	434,087,229
FLINT	3,532,433	3,906	7,992,685	0	818,368	0	19,437	0	0	0	311,325	172,565	12,850,719
DEARBORN	7,064,866	3,906	9,591,222	0	818,368	0	6,478	0	0	0	311,325	0	17,796,165
MICHIGAN STATE	70,939,364	50,000	142,329,219	182,756	66,091,399	0	3,968,640	0	0	0	18,009,070	1,660,120	303,210,568
SUBTOTAL, MICHIGAN	199,284,434	448,437	319,766,828	25,706,593	149,565,032	160,560	5,290,366	141	1,487,858	4,287,971	49,764,246	11,182,215	767,944,681
NORTH CAROLINA:													
UNV.-CHAPEL HILL	21,005,542	0	137,057,754	11,757,466	49,026,283	122,725	2,675,817	0	0	927,851	19,220,605	3,713,843	245,507,887
N.C. STATE	16,319,032	19,436,313	111,556,663	8,845,769	19,408,225	316,820	2,449,508	1,195	210,521	1,719,086	8,614,105	488,272	115,365,509
SUBTOTAL, N.CAROLINA	37,324,574	19,436,313	248,614,417	16,603,235	63,434,508	439,546	5,125,325	1,195	210,521	2,646,937	27,834,710	4,202,115	420,873,396
TEXAS:													
A AND M	30,584,858	20,634,294	202,823,673	741,582	17,256,607	553,985	821,518	0	20,208	2,458,372	15,356,756	1,178,310	292,228,213
UT-AUSTIN	21,478,453	0	178,087,575	8,909,583	55,414,873	228,169	3,717,588	0	5,675	4,481,160	16,594,998	27,641,469	316,559,543
UT-HOUSTON	901,329	0	80,416,098	3,413,997	13,730,985	30,972	559,639	3,651	407,762	339,622	4,548,896	182,651	104,535,402
SUBTOTAL, TEXAS	52,964,640	20,634,294	461,127,346	13,065,122	86,402,555	813,126	5,098,745	3,651	433,645	7,279,154	36,500,650	29,000,230	713,323,158
VIRGINIA:													
UNIV. OF VIRGINIA	29,759,723	0	88,923,184	7,299,087	11,211,840	14,781	88,201	22,531	152	955,617	11,107,599	7,122,336	176,505,051
VPI	28,683,427	10,320,782	101,108,934	3,944,228	14,576,484	248,113	3,512,107	0	5,214,988	1,295,626	10,038,156	797,795	183,740,840
SUBTOTAL, VIRGINIA	58,443,150	10,320,782	190,032,118	11,243,315	49,788,324	262,894	3,600,308	22,531	5,215,140	2,251,243	21,145,755	7,920,131	360,245,891
WISCONSIN:													
MADISON	65,700,527	8,342,117	187,739,567	26,485,408	90,414,959	393	854,574	0	131,849	358,407	23,360,912	3,273,184	402,661,897
MILWAUKEE	23,828,983	0	59,838,506	1,670,806	6,129,569	3,347	25,473	5,912	39,059	129,743	1,255,943	41,477	92,968,818
SUBTOTAL, WISCONSIN	89,529,510	8,342,117	247,578,073	28,156,214	96,544,528	3,740	880,047	5,912	170,908	488,150	24,616,855	3,314,661	495,630,715
TOTAL, PEERS	$ 591,953,571	$ 73,529,204	$ 2,305,511,557	$ 155,248,040	$ 731,335,302	$ 3,614,630	$ 55,332,868	$ 68,053	$ 16,805,798	$ 22,242,748	$ 232,545,551	$ 74,057,801	$ 4,262,245,123
MARYLAND:													
COLLEGE PARK	48,815,129	890,497	97,755,408	7,529,331	31,784,110	0	3,236,405	29,795	8,738	925,979	4,750,081	553,567	196,279,041
BALTIMORE CITY	11,352,371	99,922	66,280,362	3,776,987	22,037,453	267,761	2,944,650	0	308,637	1,379,933	2,865,716	500,393	111,814,185
EASTERN SHORE	1,456,407	1,216,520	6,554,079	152,389	876,401	0	113,840	0	0	62,090	132,915	0	10,564,591
BALTIMORE COUNTY	8,027,744	226,949	18,851,056	545,395	1,975,697	0	628,657	0	0	2,526	379,648	2,373	30,640,045
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE	8,153,717	0	0	0	1,021,175	0	2,348	0	0	0	105,846	2,150	9,285,236
CEES	0	0	3,608,406	385,296	1,002,949	0	286,505	0	0	0	359,786	0	5,612,942
CES AND AES	0	5,621,300	15,046,992	0	406,924	1,340,926	144,601	0	0	0	29,410	0	22,590,153
TOTAL,U. OF MARYLAND	$ 77,805,368	$ 8,095,188	$ 208,096,304	$ 12,354,398	$ 59,114,709	$ 1,608,687	$ 7,357,006	$ 29,795	$ 317,375	$ 2,370,478	$ 8,623,402	$ 1,058,483	$ 386,786,193

SOURCE: NCES FINANICAL STATISTICS OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, FY 1982

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 25
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AND ITS DESIGNATED PEERS
FY 1982 TOTAL EXPENDITURES BY PROGRAM

INSTITUTION	INSTRUCTION	RESEARCH	PUBLIC SERVICE	ACADEMIC SUPPORT	LIBRARY	STUDENT SERVICES	INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT	PLANT OPERATIONS	UNRESTRICTED SCHOLARSHIPS	RESTRICTED SCHOLARSHIPS	MANDATORY TRANSFERS	TOTAL EDUCATION AND G
CALIFORNIA:												
BERKELEY	$ 135,059,814	$ 88,428,646	$ 15,374,894	$ 33,963,160	$ 19,831,116	$ 23,388,770	$ 26,847,951	$ 31,035,269	$ 9,366,480	$ 14,105,311	$ 2,782	$ 377,572,327
DAVIS	101,584,589	76,727,639	7,090,072	31,415,861	10,676,547	15,483,949	15,283,360	22,285,128	3,653,576	5,834,117	180,583	279,538,474
SAN DIEGO	77,371,054	109,688,499	2,335,484	25,349,648	8,399,483	9,629,975	14,935,901	18,919,611	3,229,106	7,170,850	157,658	268,787,786
CENTRAL*	7,889,858	3,692,958	16,424,064	3,468,936	787,816	858,387	16,504,662	412,021	10,622	41,109	0	49,302,617
SUBTOTAL, U. OF C.	321,905,315	278,537,742	41,224,514	94,197,205	39,694,962	49,361,081	73,571,184	72,651,969	16,259,784	27,151,387	341,023	975,201,204
ILLINOIS:												
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN	100,412,709	89,219,586	36,932,714	42,816,553	11,685,498	6,063,019	9,556,042	29,441,436	8,706,225	5,495,847	1,104,168	329,828,299
MEDICAL CENTER	60,479,704	14,826,929	18,701,518	18,866,203	2,578,521	1,416,748	6,352,392	18,970,219	789,197	517,319	40,919	140,961,144
CHICAGO CIRCLE	35,923,071	10,202,645	935,390	13,282,408	4,532,627	3,502,481	5,983,235	14,622,064	1,539,920	828,532	22,795	86,842,541
CENTRAL	1,728,133	1,773,447	2,462,807	2,451,633	0	401,811	20,699,569	0	0	6,000	0	29,523,400
SUBTOTAL, U. OF I.	198,543,617	116,102,607	59,032,425	77,416,797	18,796,646	11,384,059	42,591,238	63,033,719	11,035,342	6,847,698	1,167,882	587,155,384
MICHIGAN:												
ANN ARBOR	170,124,759	99,874,171	8,171,737	36,304,472	13,292,820	20,272,342	29,716,580	47,104,214	16,437,645	18,702,020	1,858,593	448,566,533
FLINT	5,103,742	0	572,022	1,452,178	664,641	1,216,380	2,377,326	1,413,126	328,752	0	0	12,863,886
DEARBORN	8,506,238	0	572,022	1,815,224	664,641	1,621,787	2,080,160	1,884,168	493,129	0	223,031	17,195,759
MICHIGAN STATE	133,108,720	57,879,304	39,140,584	15,140,974	6,125,917	9,515,778	19,188,004	25,146,544	7,698,689	11,521,474	557,888	318,897,959
SUBTOTAL, MICHIGAN	316,843,459	157,753,475	48,456,365	54,712,848	20,748,019	32,626,247	53,362,070	75,548,052	24,958,215	30,223,494	2,639,512	797,123,737
NORTH CAROLINA:												
UNV.-CHAPEL HILL	120,401,371	56,529,907	52,171,619	18,506,037	10,284,105	3,598,129	13,657,181	21,959,565	1,899,578	6,840,703	140,519	295,704,109
N.C. STATE	57,582,663	50,634,685	30,105,500	12,244,808	5,003,066	2,876,871	10,153,523	13,688,988	997,504	3,664,626	16,940	181,966,308
SUBTOTAL, N. CARO.	177,984,034	107,164,092	82,277,119	30,750,845	15,287,171	6,475,000	23,810,704	35,648,553	2,897,082	10,505,329	157,459	477,670,417
TEXAS:												
A AND M	105,003,734	80,260,483	50,698,414	5,958,566	5,958,566	6,134,553	41,609,904	30,010,418	2,775,125	6,762,739	1,038,015	330,047,951
UT-AUSTIN	119,347,034	76,863,550	10,059,978	26,280,623	10,372,515	11,401,835	20,679,239	50,996,645	7,245,619	7,739,641	10,393,074	341,007,238
UT-HOUSTON	80,683,543	15,918,858	742,627	7,751,684	1,846,467	1,127,835	12,626,642	15,122,084	52,718	126,487	0	134,152,878
SUBTOTAL, TEXAS	305,034,311	172,842,891	61,501,019	39,990,873	18,177,548	18,664,223	74,915,785	96,129,147	10,073,462	14,628,867	11,427,089	805,207,667
VIRGINIA:												
UNIV. OF VIRGINIA	60,846,869	28,795,518	4,360,132	20,976,885	8,682,418	6,250,894	15,367,374	13,281,243	1,637,958	8,433,625	37,200	159,987,702
VPI	65,550,742	39,877,603	33,861,394	14,402,129	6,570,122	5,188,552	10,025,031	13,456,515	255,072	5,289,711	0	187,906,749
SUBTOTAL, VIRGINIA	126,397,611	68,673,121	38,221,526	35,379,018	15,252,540	11,439,446	25,392,405	26,737,758	1,893,030	13,723,336	37,200	347,894,451
WISCONSIN:												
MADISON	130,986,641	145,545,387	8,002,127	21,798,913	12,289,341	5,627,919	19,012,119	47,167,315	8,543,698	8,975,272	16,068,345	411,727,736
MILWAUKEE	49,345,252	7,417,797	1,330,376	5,700,840	4,111,419	5,232,688	6,371,171	12,853,604	1,432,193	2,032,179	5,507,019	97,223,119
SUBTOTAL, WISCONSIN	180,331,893	152,963,184	9,332,503	27,499,753	16,400,760	10,860,607	25,383,290	60,020,919	9,975,891	11,007,451	21,575,364	508,950,855
TOTAL, PEERS	1,627,040,240	1,054,037,112	340,040,471	359,947,339	144,357,646	140,810,663	319,026,676	429,770,117	77,092,806	114,087,762	37,345,529	4,499,203,715
MARYLAND:												
COLLEGE PARK	76,950,597	44,530,595	13,781	9,801,825	6,722,941	10,483,486	20,794,194	27,151,535	5,611,842	5,782,955	0	200,720,810
BALTIMORE CITY	40,718,312	26,113,191	0	4,240,350	2,043,641	2,364,572	8,444,886	15,263,330	839,486	469,172	0	98,453,299
EASTERN SHORE	3,037,524	2,069,758	0	478,215	433,568	1,066,840	1,539,320	1,896,159	334,776	277,322	0	10,694,718
BALTIMORE COUNTY	12,938,998	2,308,803	0	1,667,440	1,372,356	2,337,061	4,900,630	4,385,565	419,662	871,080	0	29,829,239
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE	4,429,808	917,548	1,289,607	1,031,432	44,564	1,106,254	658,826	1,001,189	201,919	327,911	0	10,964,094
CERS	0	5,141,639	0	0	0	0	532,769	0	0	0	0	5,674,408
CES AND AES	0	8,678,829	12,474,109	0	0	0	224,775	0	0	0	0	21,377,713
TOTAL, MARYLAND	$ 138,074,643	$ 89,755,363	$ 13,777,497	$ 16,819,262	$ 10,617,070	$ 17,358,213	$ 37,095,400	$ 49,697,778	$ 7,407,685	$ 7,728,440	$ 0	$ 377,714,281

SOURCE: NCES FINANCIAL STATISTICS OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, FY 1982

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 26

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AND ITS DESIGNATED PEERS

FY 1982 REVENUES PER FTES

INSTITUTION	TUITION AND FEES	FEDERAL APPROP	STATE APPROP	GRANTS AND CONTRACTS FEDERAL UNREST	FEDERAL RESTRICT	STATE UNREST	STATE RESTRICT	LOCAL UNREST	LOCAL RESTRICT	PRIVATE UNREST	PRIVATE RESTRICT	ENDOWMENTS	TOTAL
CALIFORNIA;													
BERKELEY	1,638	47	6,958	464	2,438	14	346	1	6	30	530	0	12,471
DAVIS	1,443	133	9,120	344	2,141	29	493	0	410	90	719	0	14,924
SAN DIEGO	1,581	0	8,641	1,357	8,427	12	432	1	140	106	1,147	0	21,944
CENTRAL	121	64	193	1	70	0	15	0	0	0	9	278	750
SUBTOTAL, CALIFORNIA	1,707	129	8,158	608	3,624	19	424	1	158	64	722	278	15,887
ILLINOIS:													
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN	895	429	5,379	485	1,534	22	200	0	0	30	621	53	9,649
MEDICAL CENTER	1,828	424	26,442	1,238	3,331	6	739	0	0	59	1,812	120	35,998
CHICAGO CIRCLE	957	0	3,364	150	476	6	28	0	0	12	126	1	5,119
CENTRAL	19	0	365	6	14	0	8	0	0	2	9	1	423
SUBTOTAL, ILLINOIS	1,003	293	6,661	440	1,346	16	194	0	0	28	561	42	10,585
MICHIGAN:													
ANN ARBOR	3,602	12	4,891	812	2,504	5	40	0	46	131	952	286	13,281
FLINT	1,131	1	2,558	0	262	0	6	0	0	0	100	55	4,114
DEARBORN	1,556	1	2,113	0	180	0	1	0	0	0	69	0	3,921
MICHIGAN STATE	1,841	1	3,693	4	1,715	0	103	0	0	0	467	43	7,868
SUBTOTAL, MICHIGAN	2,526	6	4,053	339	1,896	2	67	0	19	54	531	142	9,735
NORTH CAROLINA:													
U.N.C.-CHAPEL HILL	1,085	0	7,078	607	2,532	6	138	0	0	48	993	192	12,679
N.C. STATE	932	825	6,374	277	823	18	140	0	12	98	492	28	10,020
SUBTOTAL, N. CAROLINA	1,012	392	6,744	450	1,721	12	139	0	6	72	755	114	11,417
TEXAS:													
A AND M	949	640	6,284	23	535	17	25	0	1	76	476	36	9,063
UT-AUSTIN	486	0	4,033	202	1,255	5	84	0	0	101	376	626	7,168
UT-HOUSTON	369	0	32,917	1,397	5,621	13	229	1	167	139	1,862	75	42,790
SUBTOTAL, TEXAS	672	262	5,848	166	1,096	10	65	0	5	92	463	368	9,046
VIRGINIA:													
U. OF VIRGINIA	1,888	0	5,643	463	1,981	1	6	1	0	61	705	452	11,200
VPI	1,348	485	4,753	185	873	12	165	0	245	61	472	38	8,638
SUBTOTAL, VIRGINIA	1,578	279	5,132	304	1,345	7	97	1	141	61	571	214	9,728
WISCONSIN:													
MADISON	1,763	117	5,039	711	2,427	0	23	0	4	10	627	88	10,807
MILWAUKEE	1,285	0	3,226	90	330	0	1	0	2	7	68	2	5,012
SUBTOTAL, WISCONSIN	1,604	78	4,436	505	1,730	0	16	0	3	9	191	59	8,881
TOTAL, PEERS	1,480	184	5,762	388	1,828	9	138	0	42	56	581	185	10,653
MARYLAND:													
COLLEGE PARK	1,579	29	3,162	243	1,028	0	105	1	0	30	154	18	6,349
BALTIMORE CITY	2,680	24	15,647	892	5,202	63	695	0	73	326	677	118	26,396
EASTERN SHORE	1,476	1,233	6,640	154	888	0	115	0	0	63	135	0	10,704
BALTIMORE COUNTY	1,430	40	3,359	97	352	0	112	0	0	0	68	0	5,460
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE	1,938	0	0	0	243	0	1	0	0	0	25	1	2,207
CEES	0	0	79	8	22	0	6	0	0	0	8	0	122
AES AND CES	0	122	327	0	9	29	3	0	0	0	1	0	492
TOTAL, UNIV. OF MARYLAND	1,693	175	4,528	269	1,286	35	160	1	7	52	188	23	8,416

SOURCE: HEGIS FINANCIAL STATISTICS OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, FY 1982

TABLE 27
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AND ITS DESIGNATED PEERS
FY 1982 EXPENDITURES BY PROGRAM PER FTES

INSTITUTON	INSTRUCTION	RESEARCH	PUBLIC SERVICE	ACADEMIC SUPPORT	LIBRARY	STUDENT SERVICES	INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT	PHYSICAL PLANT	SCHOLARSHIPS UNRESTRICTED	SCHOLARSHIPS RESTRICTED	MANDATORY TRANSFERS	TOTAL EDUCATION AND GENERAL
CALIFORNIA:												
BERKELEY	4,689	3,070	534	1,179	689	812	932	1,078	325	490	0	13,109
DAVIS	5,595	4,226	390	1,730	588	853	842	1,227	201	321	10	15,396
SAN DIEGO	6,527	9,254	197	2,139	709	812	1,260	1,596	272	605	13	22,676
CENTRAL	134	63	279	59	13	15	281	7	0	1	0	838
SUBTOTAL, CALIFORNIA	5,473	4,736	701	1,602	675	839	1,251	1,235	276	452	8	16,582
ILLINOIS:												
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN	3,055	2,717	1,129	1,303	355	184	291	896	265	167	34	10,034
MEDICAL CENTER	15,239	3,736	4,712	4,754	650	357	1,601	4,780	199	130	10	35,519
CHICAGO CIRCLE	2,113	600	55	781	267	206	352	860	91	49	1	5,109
CENTRAL	32	33	46	46	0	7	384	0	0	0	0	548
SUBTOTAL, ILLINOIS	3,688	2,157	1,096	1,438	349	211	791	1,171	205	127	22	10,906
MICHIGAN:												
ANN ARBOR	5,205	3,056	250	1,111	407	620	909	1,441	503	572	57	13,724
FLINT	1,634	0	183	465	213	389	761	452	105	0	0	3,990
DEARBORN	1,874	0	126	800	146	357	455	415	109	0	49	3,789
MICHIGAN STATE	3,454	1,502	1,016	393	159	247	498	653	200	299	14	8,275
SUBTOTAL, MICHIGAN	4,016	2,000	618	694	263	414	676	958	316	383	33	10,105
NORTH CAROLINA:												
UNC-CHAPEL HILL	6,218	2,919	2,694	956	531	186	705	1,134	98	353	7	15,271
N.C. STATE	3,290	2,833	1,720	700	286	164	580	782	57	209	1	10,398
SUBTOTAL, N. CAROLINA	4,828	2,907	2,232	834	415	176	646	967	79	285	4	12,958
TEXAS:												
A AND M	3,256	2,483	1,572	185	185	190	1,290	931	86	210	32	10,236
UT-AUSTIN	2,702	1,740	228	595	235	258	465	1,155	164	175	235	7,722
UT-HOUSTON	33,031	6,517	304	3,173	756	462	5,109	6,191	22	52	0	54,921
SUBTOTAL, TEXAS	3,869	2,192	780	507	231	237	950	1,219	128	186	145	10,212
VIRGINIA:												
UNIV. OF VIRGINIA	3,861	1,827	277	1,331	551	397	975	843	104	535	2	10,152
VPI	3,082	1,875	1,592	677	309	244	471	633	12	249	0	8,834
SUBTOTAL, VIRGINIA	3,413	1,855	1,032	955	412	309	693	722	51	371	1	9,395
WISCONSIN:												
MADISON	3,515	3,906	215	585	330	151	510	1,266	229	241	431	11,050
MILWAUKEE	2,660	400	72	307	222	282	342	693	77	110	297	5,241
SUBTOTAL, WISCONSIN	3,231	2,741	167	493	294	195	459	1,075	179	197	387	9,119
TOTAL, PEERS	4,067	2,634	850	900	361	352	797	1,074	193	285	93	11,245
MARYLAND:												
COLLEGE PARK	2,489	1,440	0	304	217	339	673	878	182	187	0	6,493
BALTIMORE CITY	9,613	6,165	0	1,001	482	558	1,994	3,603	198	111	0	23,242
EASTERN SHORE	3,077	2,092	0	485	439	1,081	1,560	1,921	339	281	0	10,830
BALTIMORE COUNTY	2,305	411	0	297	245	416	873	781	75	155	0	5,315
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE	1,053	218	307	245	11	263	157	238	48	78	0	2,606
CEES	0	112	0	0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	123
CES AND AES	0	189	271	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	465
TOTAL, UNIV. OF MARYLAND	3,004	1,953	300	366	231	378	807	1,081	161	168	0	8,219

SOURCE: NEGIS FINANCIAL STATISTICS OF INTITUTIONS OF HIHER EDUCATION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1982

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Tuition and fee revenues varied from $369 per FTES at the University of Texas at Houston to $3,602 per FTES at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor. In Maryland, tuition and fee revenues averaged $1,693 which exceed the peer average of $1,480 by almost 15 percent. Among the designated peers, state appropriations per FTES ranged from $4,053 for the Michigan institutions to $8,158 for the California institutions. The State support for the University of Maryland averaged $4,528 in FY 1982. The average State support for the designated peers was $5,762, 27 percent greater than the University of Maryland.

Total expenditures per FTES at the University of Maryland were $8,219. When expenditures per FTES are examined by state for peers, total expenditures per FTES averaged $11,245, almost 37 percent greater than the University, and ranged from $9,119 for Wisconsin institutions to $16,582 for California institutions.

Among expenditure categories, expenditures per FTES at the peer institutions exceeded those at the University of Maryland with the exceptions of Student Services, Institutional Support and Physical Plant Maintenance. The mean expenditure for Instruction among the peers was $4,067 per FTES. Average expenditures per FTES for instruction at the University of Maryland were $3,004, 25 percent below the average of the peers.

Expenditures for Research averaged $2,634 per student among the peers compared with $1,953 at the University of Maryland. Research expenditures per FTES at all the peers clustered around $2,000 with the exception of the University of California where expenditures exceeded $4,700 per FTES. The University of Maryland's expenditures for Public Service, $300 per FTES, were far below peer expenditures of $850 per FTES.

Tables 28 and 29 display data on the individual revenue sources as a percent of total revenues, and on expenditures by program area as a percent of total educational and general expenditures. At the designated peers, tuition and fees, on the average, provided 13.9 percent of total revenues, and state appropriations provided an average share of 54.1 percent of total revenues. At the University of Maryland tuition and fees provided 20.1 percent of revenues and state appropriations accounted for 53.8 percent of revenues. Differences among the colleges were significant. At the University of Texas at Houston, tuition and fee revenues provided 0.9 percent of total revenues while state appropriations provided 76.9 percent. At the University of Michigan at Dearborn, tuition and fees provided 39.7 percent of revenues, and state appropriations provided 53.9 percent. When expenditures by program area as a percent of total expenditures are examined, the University of Maryland's expenditure pattern is similar to the peer average. The most significant difference occurs in the percent of total expenditures devoted to Public Service activities, 3.65 percent at the University of Maryland compared with 7.56 percent among the peer institutions.

Tuition and Fees

Among the peer institutions studied in this report, different policies govern the amount of tuition and fees charged to students. Table 30 displays the FY 1983 tuition and fees for the peer institutions for full-time undergraduates, graduates, medical, law, and dental students.

The institutions in the State of Texas have the lowest resident and non-resident tuition and fee charges among the peer institutions. It is the policy in Texas higher education that tuition will be a low dollar amount per credit hour (currently set by the Legislature at $4.00) and that certain other charges may exist. Because graduate students generally enroll for fewer credit hours than do undergraduate students, graduate charges are less than undergraduate charges.

TABLE 28

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND AND ITS DESIGNATED PEERS

FY 1982 REVENUES BY SOURCE AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL REVENUES

INSTITUTION	TUITION AND FEES	FEDERAL APPROP.	STATE APPROP.	GRANTS AND CONTRACTS FEDERAL UNREST.	FEDERAL RESTRICT.	STATE UNREST	STATE RESTRICT	LOCAL UNREST.	LOCAL RESTRICT	PRIVATE UNREST.	PRIVATE RESTRICT	ENDOWMENTS	TOTAL
CALIFORNIA:													
BERKELEY	13.13%	.38%	55.79%	3.72%	19.55%	.11%	2.7[illegible]%	.01%	.05%	.24%	4.25%	.00%	100.00%
DAVIS	9.67%	.89%	61.11%	2.31%	14.35%	.19%	3.[illegible]%	.00%	2.75%	.60%	4.82%	.00%	100.00%
SAN DIEGO	7.66%	.00%	39.38%	6.19%	38.40%	.06%	1.[illegible]%	.00%	.64%	.49%	5.23%	.00%	100.00%
CENTRAL*	16.13%	8.57%	25.80%	.15%	9.40%	.06%	1.97%	.00%	.03%	.01%	1.23%	36.65%	100.00%
SUBTOTAL, CALIFORNIA	10.75%	.81%	51.35%	3.83%	22.81%	.12%	2.67%	.00%	.99%	.40%	4.54%	1.73%	100.00%
ILLINOIS:													
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN	9.28%	4.45%	55.75%	5.03%	15.90%	.23%	2.07%	.00%	.00%	.31%	6.44%	.55%	100.00%
MEDICAL CENTER	5.08%	1.18%	73.45%	3.44%	9.25%	.02%	2.05%	.00%	.00%	.16%	5.03%	.33%	100.00%
CHICAGO CIRCLE	18.70%	.00%	65.72%	2.93%	9.29%	.1[illegible]%	.54%	.00%	.00%	.22%	2.46%	.02%	100.00%
CENTRAL	4.57%	.00%	86.21%	1.33%	3.24%	.02%	1.96%	.00%	.00%	.39%	2.07%	.20%	100.00%
SUBTOTAL, ILLINOIS	9.48%	2.77%	62.93%	4.16%	12.72%	.15%	1.83%	.00%	.00%	.27%	5.30%	.40%	100.00%
MICHIGAN:													
ANN ARBOR	27.13%	.09%	36.83%	6.11%	18.85%	.04%	.30%	.00%	.34%	.99%	7.17%	2.15%	100.00%
FLINT	27.49%	.03%	62.20%	.00%	6.37%	.00%	.15%	.00%	.00%	.00%	2.42%	1.34%	100.00%
DEARBORN	39.70%	.02%	53.89%	.00%	4.60%	.00%	.04%	.00%	.00%	.00%	1.75%	.00%	100.00%
MICHIGAN STATE	23.40%	.02%	46.94%	.05%	21.80%	.00%	1.31%	.00%	.00%	.00%	5.94%	.55%	100.00%
SUBTOTAL, MICHIGAN	25.95%	.06%	41.64%	3.48%	19.48%	.02%	.69%	.00%	.19%	.56%	6.48%	1.46%	100.00%
NORTH CAROLINA:													
CHAPEL HILL	8.56%	.00%	55.83%	4.79%	19.97%	.05%	1.09%	.00%	.00%	.38%	7.83%	1.51%	100.00%
NORTH CAROLINA STATE	9.31%	8.23%	63.61%	2.76%	8.22%	.18%	1.40%	.00%	.12%	.98%	4.91%	.28%	100.00%
SUBTOTAL, NORTH CAROLIN	8.87%	3.43%	59.07%	3.94%	15.07%	.10%	1.22%	.00%	.05%	.63%	6.61%	1.00%	100.00%
TEXAS:													
A AND M	10.47%	7.06%	69.34%	.25%	5.91%	.19%	.28%	.00%	.01%	.84%	5.26%	.40%	100.00%
AUSTIN	6.78%	.00%	56.26%	2.81%	17.51%	.07%	1.17%	.00%	.00%	1.42%	5.24%	8.73%	100.00%
HOUSTON	.86%	.00%	76.93%	3.27%	13.14%	.03%	.54%	.00%	.39%	.32%	4.35%	.17%	100.00%
SUBTOTAL, TEXAS	7.43%	2.89%	64.64%	1.83%	12.11%	.11%	.71%	.00%	.06%	1.02%	5.12%	4.07%	100.00%
VIRGINIA:													
UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA	16.86%	.00%	50.38%	4.14%	17.68%	.01%	.05%	.01%	.00%	.54%	6.29%	4.04%	100.00%
VPI	15.61%	5.62%	55.03%	2.15%	10.11%	.14%	1.91%	.00%	2.84%	.71%	5.46%	.43%	100.00%
SUBTOTAL, VIRGINIA	16.22%	2.86%	52.75%	3.12%	13.82%	.07%	1.00%	.01%	1.45%	.62%	5.87%	2.20%	100.00%
WISCONSIN:													
MADISON	16.32%	1.08%	46.62%	6.58%	22.45%	.00%	.21%	.00%	.03%	.09%	5.80%	.81%	100.00%
MILWAUKEE	25.63%	.00%	64.36%	1.80%	6.59%	.00%	.03%	.01%	.04%	.14%	1.35%	.04%	100.00%
SUBTOTAL, WISCONSIN	18.06%	.88%	49.95%	5.68%	19.48%	.00%	.18%	.00%	.03%	.10%	4.97%	.67%	100.00%
TOTAL, PEERS	13.89%	1.73%	54.09%	3.64%	17.16%	.08%	1.30%	.00%	.39%	.52%	5.46%	1.74%	100.00%
MARYLAND:													
COLLEGE PARK	24.87%	.45%	49.80%	3.83%	16.20%	.00%	1.6[illegible]%	.01%	.00%	.47%	2.42%	.28%	100.00%
BALTIMORE CITY	10.15%	.09%	59.28%	3.38%	19.71%	.24%	2.63%	.00%	.28%	1.23%	2.56%	.45%	100.00%
EASTERN SHORE	13.79%	11.52%	62.04%	1.44%	8.30%	.00%	1.08%	.00%	.00%	.59%	1.26%	.00%	100.00%
BALTIMORE COUNTY	26.20%	.74%	61.52%	1.78%	6.45%	.00%	2.05%	.00%	.00%	.01%	1.24%	.01%	100.00%
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE	87.81%	.00%	.00%	.00%	11.00%	.00%	.03%	.00%	.00%	.00%	1.14%	.02%	100.00%
CEES	.00%	.00%	64.29%	6.33%	17.87%	.00%	5.10%	.00%	.00%	.00%	6.41%	.00%	100.00%
CES AND AES	.00%	24.88%	66.61%	.00%	1.80%	5.94%	.64%	.00%	.00%	.00%	.13%	.00%	100.00%
TOTAL, MARYLAND	20.12%	2.08%	53.80%	3.19%	15.28%	.42%	1.90%	.01%	.08%	.61%	2.23%	.27%	100.00%

SOURCE: HEGIS FINANCIAL STATISTICS OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, FY 1982

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 29
EXPENDITURES BY PROGRAM AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL EXPENDITURES

INSTITUTION	INSTRUC-TION	RESEARCH	PUBLIC SERVICE	ACADEMIC SUPPORT	LIBRARY	STUDENT SERVICES	INSTIT. SUPPORT	PLANT OPERATION	SCHOLARSHIPS UNRES.	SCHOLARSHIPS REST.	MAND. TRANSFER	TOTAL E AND G
CALIFORNIA:												
BERKELEY	35.77 %	23.42 %	4.07 %	9.00 %	5.25 %	6.19 %	7.11 %	8.22 %	2.48 %	3.74 %	.00 %	100.00%
DAVIS	36.34 %	27.45 %	2.54 %	11.24 %	3.82 %	5.54 %	5.47 %	7.97 %	1.31 %	2.09 %	.06 %	100.00%
SAN DIEGO	28.79 %	40.81 %	.87 %	9.43 %	3.12 %	3.58 %	5.56 %	7.04 %	1.20 %	2.67 %	.06 %	100.00%
CENTRAL	16.00 %	7.49 %	33.31 %	7.04 %	1.60 %	1.74 %	33.48 %	.84 %	.02 %	.08 %	.00 %	100.00%
SUBTOTAL, CALIFORNIA	33.01 %	28.56 %	4.23 %	9.66 %	4.07 %	5.06 %	7.54 %	7.45 %	1.67 %	2.78 %	.03 %	100.00%
ILLINOIS:												
URBANA-CHAMPAIGN	30.44 %	27.07 %	11.20 %	12.98 %	3.54 %	1.84 %	2.90 %	8.93 %	2.64 %	1.67 %	.33 %	100.00%
MEDICAL CENTER	42.91 %	10.52 %	13.27 %	13.38 %	1.83 %	1.01 %	4.51 %	13.46 %	.56 %	.37 %	.03 %	100.00%
CHICAGO CIRCLE	41.37 %	11.75 %	1.08 %	15.29 %	5.22 %	4.03 %	6.89 %	16.84 %	1.77 %	.95 %	.03 %	100.00%
CENTRAL	5.85 %	6.01 %	8.34 %	8.30 %	.00 %	1.36 %	70.11 %	.00 %	.00 %	.02 %	.00 %	100.00%
SUBTOTAL, ILLINOIS	33.81 %	19.77 %	10.05 %	13.19 %	3.20 %	1.94 %	7.25 %	10.74 %	1.88 %	1.17 %	.20 %	100.00%
MICHIGAN:												
ANN ARBOR	37.93 %	22.27 %	1.82 %	8.09 %	2.96 %	4.52 %	6.62 %	10.50 %	3.66 %	4.17 %	.41 %	100.00%
FLINT	40.95 %	.00 %	4.59 %	11.65 %	5.33 %	9.76 %	19.07 %	11.34 %	2.64 %	.00 %	.00 %	100.00%
DEARBORN	49.47 %	.00 %	3.33 %	10.56 %	3.87 %	9.43 %	12.10 %	10.96 %	2.87 %	.00 %	1.30 %	100.00%
MICHIGAN STATE	41.74 %	18.15 %	12.27 %	4.75 %	1.92 %	2.98 %	6.02 %	7.89 %	2.41 %	3.61 %	.17 %	100.00%
SUBTOTAL, MICHIGAN	39.75 %	19.79 %	6.08 %	6.86 %	2.60 %	4.09 %	6.69 %	9.48 %	3.13 %	3.79 %	.33 %	100.00%
NORTH CAROLINA:												
UNC- CHAPEL HILL	40.72 %	19.12 %	17.64 %	6.26 %	3.48 %	1.22 %	4.62 %	7.43 %	.64 %	2.31 %	.05 %	100.00%
N.C. STATE	31.64 %	27.83 %	16.54 %	6.73 %	2.75 %	1.58 %	5.58 %	7.52 %	.55 %	2.01 %	.01 %	100.00%
SUBTOTAL,NORTH CAROLINA	37.26 %	22.43 %	17.22 %	6.44 %	3.20 %	1.36 %	4.98 %	7.46 %	.61 %	2.20 %	.03 %	100.00%
TEXAS:												
A AND M	31.81 %	24.26 %	15.36 %	1.81 %	1.81 %	1.86 %	12.61 %	9.09 %	.84 %	2.05 %	.31 %	100.00%
UT-AUSTIN	35.00 %	22.54 %	2.95 %	7.71 %	3.04 %	3.34 %	6.06 %	14.95 %	2.12 %	2.27 %	3.05 %	100.00%
UT- HOUSTON	60.14 %	11.87 %	.55 %	5.78 %	1.38 %	.84 %	9.41 %	11.27 %	.04 %	.09 %	.00 %	100.00%
SUBTOTAL, TEXAS	37.88 %	21.47 %	7.64 %	4.97 %	2.26 %	2.32 %	9.30 %	11.94 %	1.25 %	1.82 %	1.42 %	100.00%
VIRGINIA:												
UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA	38.03 %	18.00 %	2.73 %	13.11 %	5.43 %	3.91 %	9.61 %	8.30 %	1.02 %	5.27 %	.02 %	100.00%
VPI	34.88 %	21.22 %	18.02 %	7.66 %	3.50 %	2.76 %	5.34 %	7.16 %	.14 %	2.82 %	.00 %	100.00%
SUBTOTAL, VIRGINIA	36.33 %	19.74 %	10.99 %	10.17 %	4.38 %	3.29 %	7.30 %	7.69 %	.54 %	3.94 %	.01 %	100.00%
WISCONSIN:												
MADISON	31.81 %	35.35 %	1.94 %	5.29 %	2.98 %	1.37 %	4.62 %	11.46 %	2.08 %	2.18 %	3.90 %	100.00%
MILWAUKEE	50.75 %	7.63 %	1.37 %	5.86 %	4.23 %	5.38 %	6.55 %	13.22 %	1.47 %	2.09 %	5.66 %	100.00%
SUBTOTAL, WISCONSIN	35.43 %	30.05 %	1.83 %	5.40 %	3.22 %	2.13 %	4.99 %	11.79 %	1.96 %	2.16 %	4.24 %	100.00%
TOTAL, PEERS	36.16 %	23.43 %	7.56 %	8.00 %	3.21 %	3.13 %	7.09 %	9.55 %	1.71 %	2.54 %	.83 %	100.00%
MARYLAND:												
COLLEGE PARK	38.34 %	22.19 %	.01 %	4.68 %	3.35 %	5.22 %	10.36 %	13.53 %	2.80 %	2.88 %	.00 %	100.00%
BALTIMORE CITY	41.36 %	26.52 %	.00 %	4.31 %	2.08 %	2.40 %	8.58 %	15.50 %	.85 %	.48 %	.00 %	100.00%
EASTERN SHORE	28.40 %	19.31 %	.00 %	4.47 %	4.05 %	9.98 %	14.39 %	17.73 %	3.13 %	2.59 %	.00 %	100.00%
BALTIMORE COUNTY	43.38 %	7.74 %	.00 %	5.59 %	4.60 %	7.83 %	16.43 %	14.70 %	1.41 %	2.92 %	.00 %	100.00%
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE	40.40 %	8.37 %	11.76 %	9.41 %	.41 %	10.09%	6.01 %	9.13 %	1.84 %	2.99 %	.00 %	100.00%
CEES	.00 %	90.61 %	.00 %	.00 %	.00 %	.00 %	9.39 %	.00 %	.00 %	.00 %	.00 %	100.00%
CES AND AES	.00 %	40.60 %	58.35 %	.00 %	.00 %	.00 %	1.05 %	.00 %	.00 %	.00 %	.00 %	100.00%
TOTAL, MARYLAND	36.56 %	23.76 %	3.65 %	4.45 %	2.81 %	4.60 %	9.82 %	13.16 %	1.96 %	2.05 %	.00 %	100.00%

SOURCE: HEGIS FINANCIAL STATISTICS OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION FOR FY 1982

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 30

Tuition and Fees

1982-83

	Undergraduate Full-Time		Graduate Full-Time		Medicine		Law		Dentistry	
	Resident	Non-Resident	Resident	Non-Resident	Resident	Non-Resident	Resident	Non-Resident	Resident	Non-Resident
University of California										
Berkeley	$1,194	$4,344	$1,240	$4,390	$ -	$ -	$1,240	$4,390	$ -	$ -
Davis	1,194	4,344	1,240	4,390	1,240	4,390	-	-	1,240	4,390
San Diego	1,194	4,344	1,240	4,390	1,240	4,390	-	-	1,240	4,390
University of Illinois										
Urbana-Champaign	1,210	2,854	962	2,322	-	-	1,222	3,015	-	-
Chicago Center	1,200	2,844	1,452	3,260	1,920	5,760	-	-	3,924	11,772
University of Michigan (1)										
Ann Arbor	2,144	6,014	2,966	6,310	4,804	9,164	3,340	7,058	4,404	8,328
Flint	1,356	4,392	1,528	4,756	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dearborn	1,528	4,692	1,628	5,276	-	-	-	-	-	-
Michigan State (1)	1,696	3,614	1,200	2,200	2,589	5,139	-	-	-	-
University of North Carolina										
Chapel Hill	702	2,526	698	2,522	1,243	3,061	729	2,553	1,483	3,301
North Carolina State	682	2,506	682	2,506	-	-	-	-	-	-
University of Texas										
Austin	453	1,533	393	1,257	-	-	400	1,200	-	-
Health Science-Houston	453	1,533	393	1,257	400	1,200	-	-	400	1,200
Texas A&M	462	1,542	402	1,266	-	-	-	-	-	-
University of Virginia	1,350	3,276	1,350	3,276	3,946	8,146	2,088	3,946	-	-
VPI	1,281	2,576	1,422	1,557	-	-	-	-	-	-
University of Wisconsin										
Madison	1,122	3,900	1,360	4,130	2,628	4,517	1,370	4,286	-	-
Milwaukee	1,154	3,932	1,328	4,096	-	-	-	-	-	-
University of Maryland										
College Park	1,185	3,303	1,694	3,014	-	-	-	-	-	-
Baltimore City	1,136	3,298	1,565	3,493	4,171	7,564	2,283	4,097	3,847	7,175
Eastern Shore	968	2,716	1,608	2,928	-	-	-	-	-	-
Baltimore County	1,224	3,342	1,630	2,950	-	-	-	-	-	-
University College	----------NOT APPLICABLE----------									

(1) Undergraduate tuition represents the average of lower division and upper division charges.

SOURCE: Illinois, Michigan State and Wisconsin - Lovejoy's College Guide and Dougherty and Livesey's Guide to American Graduate Schools; Other Institutions - institutional representatives.

North Carolina does not differentiate between undergraduate and graduate student charges. Thus, graduate and undergraduate charges are the same, and are the second lowest among the peer institutions. The University of California has adopted the policy of "no tuition" to resident students. As a result, all of the charges in the University of California system are called "fees," and may not be used in lieu of tuition. This policy serves to make the in-state charges for the professional schools of medicine, law, and dentistry, a bargain to California residents. This is also the result in Texas of its low cost policy.

The State of Virginia has adopted a statewide tuition policy that relates tuition charges to the cost of education. In 1982, the Virginia Legislature instituted a new policy that sets undergraduate resident tuitions at 25 percent of cost, in-state graduate tuition at 35 percent of cost, out-of-state undergraduate tuition at 60 percent of cost, and non-resident graduate tuition at 85 percent of cost. Each institution is responsible for generating a certain amount of revenue and the Board of Visitors for each institution actually sets the tuition rate. The resulting revenue requirements range from 30 to 35 percent of total cost.

The Illinois Board of Higher Education tuition policy sets tuition rates at a base amount plus adjustments indexed to the Higher Education Price Index. Undergraduate resident tuitions are set at approximately one-third of cost, and non-resident tuitions are three times resident. At the University of Illinois, lower division undergraduate students are charged less than upper division students.

The University of Michigan and Michigan State University have had the policy of differentiating charges by level of enrollment for several years. Lower division students pay less than upper division students who, in turn, pay less than graduate students. Non-resident undergraduate and graduate tuition charges are at least twice the resident charges. Because the State of Michigan has been in a period of fiscal crisis, tuition charges at the University of Michigan and Michigan State University have dramatically increased in recent years to provide sufficient revenues for the institutions to operate.

Wisconsin indexes tuition to the cost of instruction, where the cost of instruction is defined as the direct costs of instruction, plus pro rata shares of other costs. The average costs of instruction for a group of universities, taken over a three year period, are derived to be used in determining cost. Resident undergraduate students pay 25 percent of the undergraduate cost of instruction and non-resident undergraduates pay 100 percent of cost. Resident graduate students pay 20 percent of the graduate cost of instruction while non-resident graduate students pay 70 percent of the graduate cost.

The SBHE has established a tuition and fee policy for the public four-year institutions in Maryland. It requires that the State support 70 percent of the guideline expenditures with tuition and fees supporting the remaining 30 percent. Currently, tuition and fees account formore than 35 percent of the guideline expenditures. The University of Maryland had undergraduate resident tuition and fee charges that were more than those of peer institutions in North Carolina and Texas and about the same as those in California. At the graduate level, institutions in Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin have higher charges than does the University of Maryland.

Guidelines

The two previous sections outlined the financial resources currently available to the University of Maryland and its peers. The funding levels that exist are the product of a wide range of budget processes used by the various states, and to a significant extent the historic funding levels of each of the institutions. It is clear from the data that the University of Maryland is less well funded than peer institutions. An important issue that this study attempted to address is whether the existing budget guidelines used in Maryland would provide an adequate level of financial support if fully funded.

In the review of operating budgets, the Maryland State Board for Higher Education uses a set of "guidelines" to evaluate the operating budgets of Maryland institutions of higher education. The guidelines focus on productivity by estimating the number of students to be served and the nature of the services to be provided. The guidelines focus on total expenditures and enable comparisons to be made among similar programs at different institutions.

The guidelines are a set of mathematical formulas that provide a method of equitably distributing funds to institutions in an equal manner for performing comparable tasks. The guidelines were derived to represent the average level of expenditures in a program for all institutions of a given size; the guidelines represent a set of norms for institutional expenditure by program. Guidelines were developed for the six common program areas in Maryland institutions - Instruction, Library, Administration, Student Services, Physical Plant Operation and Maintenance, and Public Safety. Funding levels for other programs are evaluated independently.

For the purposes of this study, an effort was made to calculate guideline amounts of the campuses that are designated peers of the University of Maryland: the University of California - Berkeley, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the University of Michigan - Ann Arbor, and the University of Texas at Austin. The data to run the SBHE guidelines were provided to the staff on their visits to these campuses. Data to make such comparisons for the other campuses were unavailable.

Table 31 displays information on the percentage distribution of credit hours by level of instruction for each of the campuses. Among the campuses, variations in the distribution of credit hours exist. The University of Michigan at Ann Arbor had the highest percentage of graduate and graduate research credit hours, 32.6 percent, while the University of Maryland at College Park had the lowest percentage of graduate and graduate research credit hours, 7.7 percent.

Based upon the best available information, the SBHE staff calculated guideline amounts. Table 32 outlines the guidelines. There are significant difficulties associated with trying to use data provided by a variety of individuals, and data collected for purposes other than calculating Maryland guidelines. Therefore, the resulting calculations for peer institutions should be viewed as rough estimates and used only as an indicator of relative standing.

For purposes of comparing calculated guideline amounts, the total estimates generated were divided by full-time equivalent students. Full-time equivalent students were calculated by taking the sum of the total undergraduate credit hours divided by thirty, the total graduate credit hours divided by twenty-four, and the total graduate research credit hours divided by sixteen. For the University of Calfornia at Berkeley, the guideline amount per FTES ws calculated at $6,350; for the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, the guideline amount per FTES was $5,350; for the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, the amount was $7,000 per FTES, and for the University of Texas at Austin the amount was $4,750. The calculated guideline amount per FTES for the University of Maryland at College Park was $4,000, which is significantly less than the guideline cost at any of the peer institutions.

The differences in calculated guideline estimates are attributable to a number of factors, but primarily to differences in enrollment patterns by level and type of program, and differences in the total size of facilities at the campus. For example, an institution with a higher level of enrollment at the

Table 31

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF CREDIT HOURS, FY 1982

	Lower Division (%)	Upper Division (%)	Graduate (%)	Graduate Research (%)	Total (%)
University of California Berkeley					
Low Cost	1.0	3.5	5.7	0.2	10.4
Medium-Low Cost	19.8	24.6	4.4	2.7	51.5
Medium-High Cost	9.0	14.2	5.4	3.8	32.4
High Cost	0.7	2.4	2.3	0.3	5.7
Total	30.5	44.7	17.8	7.0	100.0
University of Illinois Urbana Champaign					
Low Cost	2.2	6.1	3.1	1.0	12.4
Medium-Low Cost	22.8	16.1	2.9	3.3	45.1
Medium-High Cost	10.9	16.6	4.3	6.9	38.7
High Cost	0.3	1.1	2.1	0.3	3.8
Total	36.2	39.9	12.4	11.5	100.0
University of Michigan Ann Arbor					
Low Cost	1.9	3.7	6.5	0.1	12.2
Medium-Low Cost	20.6	15.9	6.2	1.5	44.2
Medium-High Cost	9.3	12.1	4.0	1.1	26.5
High Cost	1.1	2.8	12.8	0.4	17.1
Total	32.9	34.5	29.5	3.1	100.0
University of Texas Austin					
Low Cost	3.5	9.3	6.0	0.4	19.2
Medium-Low Cost	27.7	12.2	2.1	1.2	43.4
Medium-High Cost	15.3	11.7	3.3	2.7	33.0
High Cost	0.4	2.9	0.8	0.3	4.4
Total	47.1	36.1	12.2	4.6	100.0
University of Maryland College Park					
Low Cost	3.7	6.1	1.0	0.1	10.9
Medium-Low Cost	30.8	19.7	1.9	0.5	52.9
Medium-High Cost	17.4	13.4	2.9	0.8	34.5
High Cost	0.5	0.7	0.5	0.0	1.7
Total	52.4	39.9	6.3	1.4	100.0

SOURCE: Institutional Reports

Table 32

BUDGET GUIDELINES

FY 1982

INSTRUCTION GUIDELINE:

A. Adjusted Cost = $182,745 + 37% of (the average of 80 and 82 research dollars) + matrix (1982 credit hours)

B. Adjusted cost = $182,745 + 37% of (the average of 80 and 82 research dollars) + matrix (average of 80 and 82 credit hours)

Cost of Credit Hour

	Lower Division	Upper Division	Graduate	Graduate Research
Low	$20.075	$ 60.225	$120.45	$160.60
Medium-Low	30.1125	90.3375	180.675	240.90
Medium-High	40.15	120.45	240.90	321.20
High	50.1875	150.5625	301.125	401.50

An institution should use the option which generates the larger guideline amount.

LIBRARY GUIDELINE:

Cost = $201,957 + 24.65 (5% of ALA standard BVE's) + $1.53 x + $555 (1980 faculty positions) + 6% of (average of 80 and 82 research dollars - $10 M) where X = (average of 1980 and 1982 undergraduate credit hours + 3 (average of 1980 and 1982 graduate credit hours) + 5 (average of 1980 and 1982 graduate research credit hours)

PUBLIC SAFETY GUIDELINES:

Cost = $65,065 + $2.95 FTES + $0.28 GSF + $74,650 (urban factor)

ADMINISTRATION GUIDELINE:

Cost = $173,007 + $120 (average of 1980 and 1982 headcount) + $100,139 (number of non-guidelines programs).

STUDENT SERVICES GUIDELINE:

Cost = $89,195 + $229 (number of 1980 admissions applications) + $75 (average of 1980 and 1982 FTES).

PLANT OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE BUIDELINE:

Cost = $256,040 + $153 (average of 1980 and 1982 headcount) +$0.66 (1982 non-auxiliary GSF) + fuel.

graduate and graduate research level will generate not only more dollars for Instruction but will also generate a greater library support requirement. An institution with a high volume of research funding will also generate a higher level of library support.

In the area of physical facilities, the greater number of GSF that exist in non-auxiliary facilities, the more dollars generated for Physical Plant Maintenance and Operation and Public Safety programs. This is without regard to any analysis of space requirements. The support reflects all the non-auxiliary facilities that exist, not only those facilities required to support the current set of institutional programs and operations.

The guideline estimate per FTES at UMCP is the lowest of the institutions calculated because UMCP has from 3,000,000 to 5,000,000 fewer GSF of non-auxiliary space than any of the other institutions, despite the fact that its headcount enrollment exceeds all but Texas-Austin. In addition, because UMCP has the lowest proportion of its students enrolled at the graduate and graduate research levels, fewer dollars are generated for Instruction and Libraries.

This analysis persuaded the SBHE staff that the existing budget guidelines are sufficiently flexible to recommend the relatively high levels of support required by a major research university, once the programs and facilities are in place. However, the guidelines do not provide funds to allow an institution to initiate new programs or to reconfigure its existing programs to generate these higher levels of support. Of equal or greatersignificance, the guidelines are not fully funded in Maryland, compounding the problem of attaining adequate support.

CONCLUSION

This report was written to provide information on a wide variety of areas for which comparison among institutions/systems can be made. It is clear that the University of Maryand receives less in State support per FTES and in Total support per FTES than any of the peer systems. It also is clear that in specific areas grave deficiencies exist.

Furthermore, the peers of the University of Maryland are aspirational in certain respects. The peer systems enroll more high ability undergraduate students and provide more graduate education than the University of Maryland. The peer systems receive more funding for research than the University. However, the University of Maryland compares favorably with its peers in terms of the quality of its graduate programs.

This paper should be used as a benchmark from which the University's progress in becoming one of the best public universities in the country can be measured.

APPENDIX A

PEERS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND'S DESIGNATED PEERS

Among the institutions that were designated as peers of the University of Maryland, several have identified a set of institutions as their "peers." That is, other institutions employ the peer concept in discussions, presentations, defenses, etc., of budgets and faculty salaries.

Table 33 lists the sets of peer institutions to which the colleges and universities in this study compare themselves. Although variation exists among the colleges that are chosen as peers of the institutions, several universities appear on the majority of the lists. For example, the University of Michigan, the University of Illinois, and the University of Wisconsin are listed by all the institutions that indicated that they used the "peer" concept.

The University of California utilizes the peer concept to justify faculty salary increases. The eight institutions listed for the Berkeley campus include those universities with which the University of California-Berkeley competes for faculty members.

The peer institutions listed for the University of Illinois were developed by the staff of the Illinois Board of Higher Education using a complex, statistical methodology. Peer institutions for all of the public universities in the state of Illinois were identified in the Illinois study. The University of Illinois is the only institution in this study that identified the University of Maryland at College Park as one of its comparison institutions. Data from the comparison institutions are used by the Illinois Board in faculty salary and cost comparisons.

The University of Wisconsin has used the peer institution concept to compare funding of the University of Wisconsin system with funding of a group of national peer institutions. Institutions were compared both on the basis of campus by campus, and also on the basis of the system as a whole. However, the definition of "funding" was limited to instructional funding only; other aspects of the university budget, including physical facilities, research, and public service were not addressed.

Table 33

Comparative Institutions Used By The University Of Maryland's Peers

University of California	University of Illinois	U. T. - Austin	U. W. - Madison	U. W. - Milwaukee
				U. of Alabama-Birmingham
		U.C - Berkeley		
		UCLA		
Cornell				
				Cleveland State
				U of Cincinnati
	University of Florida			
				U. of Houston
Harvard				
U. of Illinois		Univer.of Illinois	Univ. of Illinois	U. of Illinois
		Indiana U.	Indiana U.	
			Iowa	
	U. of Md. College Park			
				U.of Mass-Boston
U. of Michigan	Univ. of Michigan	Univ. of Michigan	Univ. of Michigan	
	Michigan State	Michigan State	Michigan State	
	Univ. of Minnesota	Univ. of Minnesota	Univ. of Minnesota	
				U. of Missouri
SUNY - Buffalo				CUNY - City
		U. of N. Carolina		
	Ohio State	Ohio State	Ohio State	
	Penn. State			U. of Pittsburgh
	Purdue		Purdue	
Stanford				Temple
	U.T.- Austin			
	Texas A & M			
	U. of Washington	Univ. of Washington		Wayne State
U. of Wisc.-Madison	U. of Wisc.-Madison	U. of Wisc.-Madison		
Yale				

APPENDIX B

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Included in this study are three campuses of the University of California-Berkeley, Davis, and San Diego. The University of California has a central administrative unit whose expenditures are reported voluntarily on a separate HEGIS finance form. Staff of the National Center for Education Statistics allocate revenues and expenditures of the central administrative unit to each of the University of California teaching campuses. To allocate expenditures NCES used the number of students enrolled. The University of California believes this is a reasonable allocation method. If HEGIS finance data for the University of California are received from a source other than NCES, the allocation of central administrative expenditures to the campuses will not have been made.

Among the University of California campuses, some data items were reported in a manner that were not consistent with that of other campuses. At the University of California at Berkeley, Instruction expenditures reported on Part B, Line 1 of the form include costs of extension courses. However, the enrollment in extension courses were not reported in the opening fall enrollment report. Consequently, the cost per student of instruction was overstated. This situation was also the case at the Davis campus.

At Berkeley, student services expenditures on line 6, Part B included the costs of intercollegiate athletics. Revenues from sales of intercollegiate athletic tickets were shown as sales and services of educational activities, line 15, Part A. At UCLA, in contrast, expenditures for intercollegiate athletics were shown in Auxiliary Enterprises, line 14, Part B while revenues were shown in Sales and Services of Auxiliary Enterprises, line 16, Part A.

The University of California manages several large, federally funded research centers, including the Los Alamos Laboratories, the Lawrence Hall of Science, and the Scripps Oceanographic Institute. Expenditures and revenues for

the Berkeley Lawrence Hall were reported in the University of California - Berkeley report. State funds for the Hall of Science also were included. The Scripps Institute was included in the San Diego campus expenditure and revenue data.

On the Survey of Faculty Salaries, Fringe Benefits and Tenure, the University of California campuses report no faculty holding the rank of "instructor" but do report faculty holding the rank of "lecturer." UC staff pointed out that these ranks are equivalent in the University of California system.

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

The University of Illinois has included three campuses, Urbana-Champaign, Chicago Circle, and Medical Center, and a central administrative office in its HEGIS universe. Beginning in FY 1983, the two campuses in Chicago, the Medical Center and Chicago Circle, will be combined into one campus called the University of Illinois at Chicago. The combination of the two campuses into one with a name very similar to the current "Chicago Circle" will not effect the FY 1983 survey forms, but may become a problem in future years in longitudinal studies.

Allocation of the costs of Central Administration of the University of Illinois has been made to the campuses by NCES based on campus enrollment. Unlike the University of California, the University of Illinois staff stated that this allocation was incorrect because the actual costs were not related to the number of students. The Medical Center had costs of administration that were not related to the number of students, but rather to the number of patients and the number of grants. The University of Illinois included all of the costs of administrative computing and business and finance in Central Administration expenses. Thus, the Institutional Support expenditures reported for each of the three campuses were understated compared to other university campuses in other states.

The University of Illinois at Chicago Circle reported the costs of intercollegiate athletics on Line 6, Part B, Student Services, and the related revenues on Line 15, Part A. The Medical Center had no intercollegiate athletic activities. However, the Urbana-Champaign campus' intercollegiate athletic expenditures and revenues were not included in the HEGIS survey at all. The University of Illinois Athletic Association is a separate entity responsible for the intercollegiate athletic program on this campus; none of its expenditures or revenues have ever been reported to HEGIS. None of the Athletic Association's scholarship expenditures were reported. The faculty report did not include salary supplements for endowed professorships and chairs funded by the University of Illinois Foundation.

Because the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign is the land-grant campus in Illinois, costs of the Agricultural Experiment Station and the Cooperative Extension Service were reported on the UIUC HEGIS surveys. Extension enrollments, however, were not included in the campus enrollment reports.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

The University of Michigan includes three campuses, Ann Arbor, Flint, and Dearborn in its HEGIS universe. Expenditures of the Central Administrative unit, which is located in Ann Arbor, were included in the HEGIS finance survey, and were allocated to the campuses by the University of Michigan. However, since the 1980 HEGIS finance reports, the University has been using a different method of allocation of all revenues and costs than had been used in the past. The University of Michigan receives lump sum revenues for all of its campuses, and reports lump sum to the state legislature. Allocations to the campuses are made by the central administrative staff.

Since internal documents have been kept on the basis of the total University of Michigan, since 1980 the University has reported to NCES revenues and expenditures that represent the same percentages of total expenditures and revenues for each campus that existed in 1980. Although the total dollar amount for the University is correct, reported allocations to each campus may not accurately reflect actual revenues and expenditures.

The University of Michigan campus at Ann Arbor includes a medical school. All of the costs of the medical school were included in reports, including the costs of medical residents. However, no salaries related to patient care were included among the expenditures.

The University of Michigan has a foundation that serves as the fundraising arm of the University. Named professorships, chairs, and other grant funds that were received by the Foundation were not reported on the HEGIS survey.

NORTH CAROLINA

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and North Carolina State University are the only two campuses in North Carolina that are included in this study. Expenditures and revenues at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill included costs and funds attributable to regional health education centers that are located around the state. However, central administrative costs of the University of North Carolina were not allocated to the campuses, nor reported on any HEGIS survey.

Chapel Hill included in the HEGIS reports its medical school and hospital while North Carolina State is the land-grant institution in North Carolina and included the costs of Agricultural Extension and the Cooperative Extension Service. Extension enrollments were included in the campus reports.

TEXAS

Included in this study were two campuses of the University of Texas, Austin and Houston, and Texas A and M. The University of Texas at Houston includes a health science center and hospital, while the A and M campus, as the land grant campus, includes the Agriculture Experiment Station, the Cooperative Extension Service, Engineering Extension and Experiment Station, and the Transportation Institute. Revenues and expenditures for these subunits were reported as a part of the HEGIS universe. System administration costs are not included for either the University of Texas or Texas A and M.

Several years ago the State of Texas began to pay the employees' contribution to FICA; these amounts were not reported in salary data, nor were supplements to salaries for chairs or other add on grants reported on the faculty salary form. Consequently, at the full professor level, average faculty salaries were understated by $1,000, on the average at the University of Texas at Austin. Fringe benefits are reported only for those benefits for which direct appropriations are a part of the institutions budget. Amounts reported are a small part of the total costs; retirement costs are not included in the HEGIS finance form.

Faculty salary data are based on budgeted, not actual, expenditure levels. Consequently, the number of faculty is overestimated because all budgeted positions are assumed to be filled. All institutions have separately budgeted Security programs. Expenditures for this program are reported on Line 8, Part B, of the HEGIS finance form.

VIRGINIA

The University of Virginia at Charlottesville and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University were the two Virginia institutions included in this study. The University of Virginia does include a medical school; VPI is the land-grant institution in Virginia and included a School of Veternary Medicine, Cooperative Extension, and a satellite teaching center in its reports. The University of Virginia also included the revenues and expenditures related to continuing education in its HEGIS finance survey.

WISCONSIN

Two campuses of the University of Wisconsin system, Madison and Milwaukee, were included in this study. Central administrative costs were not allocated to the campuses, and were not reported on any HEGIS finance form. The University of Wisconsin at Madison includes a medical school and reports revenues and expenditures of the hospital on the HEGIS finance form. Appropriations of state funds to the hospital are included on Line 3, Part A of the form. The University of Wisconsin is the land grant institution in Wisconsin, and includes expenditures for the Cooperative Extension Service in its reports.